DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 065 CE 029 115

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Program Evaluations: CETA Youth Programs in Small Cities. Youth Knowledge Development Report 3.18. |
| INSTITUTION | National League of Cities, Washington, D.C. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Youth Programs. |
| PUB DATE | May 80 |
| NOTE | 152p.; For a related document see CE 029 106. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (Stock No. 029-014-00157-1, $5.00). |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC07 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Adolescents; Career Education; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Job Training; *Municipalities; National Surveys; Program Administration; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Program Improvement; Rural Areas; Young Adults; *Youth Employment; *Youth Programs |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Small Cities |

ABSTRACT

This report makes recommendations to enhance the delivery of Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) services to small-city youth. It draws on the data base created by National League of Cities Youth Employment activities which provided a profile of the small city in CETA youth program operations, identified kinds of problems that affect delivery of CETA services to small city youth, and examined the CETA administrative structures that determine how planning decisions are made and who makes them. Section 1 describes project activities and outlines the methodology used in developing the data base. Section 2 provides a statistical profile of the small city in CETA youth operations based largely on data generated by a nation-wide survey of small cities. Section 3 discusses characteristics of small cities that affect planning and implementing CETA youth programs and examines some problems of program administration in small and rural communities. Section 4 attempts to draw general conclusions and offer recommendations to enhance delivery of CETA youth services in small cities. Appendixes contain methodology and statistical tables of the mail survey and summaries of model youth programs operating in small and rural cities. (YLB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

# YOUTH KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT REPORT

## PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
## CETA Youth Programs in Small Cities

ED203065

G029115

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

May 1980

YOUTH KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT REPORT 3.18

# CETA YOUTH PROGRAMS IN SMALL CITIES

National League of Cities
May 1980

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

## OVERVIEW

There is some truth to the charge that employment and training programs have been designed for large cities. Implicit in CETA legislation and regulations are certain assumptions about the diversity of service deliverers in a community, the structure of decisionmaking, the capacity to achieve economies of scale in administration and even the nature of employment problems and their best solutions. To be a prime sponsor eligible for direct funding by formula, a jurisdiction or combination of jurisdictions must have a population of at least 100,000. Yet, two-fifths of the poor live outside metropolitan areas and three-fifths outside central cities of 50,000 or more.

This review of the youth program experience in small cities suggests that there is inadequate involvement of local decisionmakers and that procedures frequently stand in the way of mounting effective programs. The responsibility for operating small city programs tends to lie outside these cities. A fifth of small cities participate in local consortia but a third are in state-administered prime sponsors and 46 percent are served by single-county prime sponsors. Only a fifth of the jurisdictions serve as contractors on a subgrant arrangement and less than two-fifths have any formal participation in the development of local CETA primes.

The activities themselves face significant constraints. Transportation is a major issue as well as limitations in the diversity of potential work and training sites. Grant administration procedures are so complex that they preclude participation in many cases. Categorization of programs complicates the situation immensely since each program may provide only a few slots to the local areas but requires separate procedures. There has been no consistent effort by the Department of Labor to inform small cities of their potential role and to help them build capacity. OJT regulations and wage standards are sometimes unrealistic in the small town setting. The analysis suggests ways these problems can be addressed.

This study is one of "knowledge development" activities mounted in conjunction with research, evaluation and development activities funded under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977. The knowledge development effort will result in literally thousands of written products. Each activity has been structured from the outset so that it is self-standing but also interrelated with a host of other activities. The framework is presented in A Knowledge Development Plan for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, A Knowledge Development Plan for the Youth Initiatives Fiscal 1979 and Completing the Youth Agenda: A Plan for Knowledge Development, Dissemination and Application for Fiscal 1980.

Information is available or will be coming available from these various knowledge development efforts to help resolve an almost limitless array of issues. However, policy and practical application will usually require integration and synthesis from a wide range of products, which, in turn, depend on knowledge and availability of these products. A major shortcoming of past research, evaluation and demonstration activities has been the failure to organize and disseminate the products adequately to

assure the full exploitation of the findings. The magnitude and structure of the youth knowledge development effort puts a premium on structured analysis and wide dissemination.

As part of its knowledge development mandate, therefore, the Office of Youth Programs of the Department of Labor will organize, publish and disseminate the written products of all major research, evaluation and demonstration activities supported directly by or mounted in conjunction with OYP knowledge development efforts. Some of the same products may also be published and disseminated through other channels, but they will be included in the structured series of Youth Knowledge Development Reports in order to facilitate access and integration.

The Youth Knowledge Development Reports, of which this is one, are divided into twelve broad categories:

1. Knowledge Development Framework: The products in this category are concerned with the structure of knowledge development activities, the assessment methodologies which are employed, the measurement instruments and their validation, the translation of knowledge into policy, and the strategy for dissemination of findings.

2. Research on Youth Employment and Employability Development: The products in this category represent analyses of existing data, presentation of findings from new data sources, special studies of dimensions of youth labor market problems, and policy issue assessments.

3. Program Evaluations: The products in this category include impact, process and benefit-cost evaluations of youth programs including the Summer Youth Employment Program, Job Corps, the Young Adult Conservation Corps, Youth Employment and Training Programs, Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects, and the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit.

4. Service and Participant Mix: The evaluations and demonstrations summarized in this category concern the matching of different types of youth with different service combinations. This involves experiments with work vs. work plus remediation vs. straight remediation as treatment options. It also includes attempts to mix disadvantaged and more affluent participants, as well as youth with older workers.

5. Education and Training Approaches: The products in this category present the findings of structured experiments to test the impact and effectiveness of various education and vocational training approaches including specific education methodologies for the disadvantaged, alternative education approaches and advanced career training.

6. Pre-Employment and Transition Services: The products in this category present the findings of structured experiments to test the impact and effectiveness of school-to-work transition activities, vocational exploration, job-search assistance and other efforts to better prepare youth for labor market success.

7. Youth Work Experience: The products in this category address the organization of work activities, their output, productive roles for youth, and the impacts of various employment approaches.

8. Implementation Issues: This category includes cross-cutting analyses of the practical lessons concerning "how-to-do-it." Issues such as learning curves, replication processes and programmatic "batting averages" will be addressed under this category, as well as the comparative advantages of alternative delivery agents.

9. Design and Organizational Alternatives: The products in this category represent assessments of demonstrations of alternative program and delivery arrangements such as consolidation, year-round preparation for summer programs, the use of incentives, and multi-year tracking of individuals.

10. Special Needs Groups: The products in this category present findings on the special problems of and the programmatic adaptations needed for significant segments including minorities, young mothers, troubled youth, Indochinese refugees, and the handicapped.

11. Innovative Approaches: The products in this category present the findings of those activities designed to explore new approaches. The subjects covered include the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects, private sector initiatives, the national youth service experiment, and energy initiatives in weatherization. low-head hydroelectric dam restoration, windpower, and the like.

12. Institutional Linkages: The products in this category include studies of institutional arrangements and linkages as well as assessments of demonstration activities to encourage such linkages with education, volunteer groups, drug abuse, and other youth serving agencies.

In each of these knowledge development categories, there will be a range of discrete demonstration, research and evaluation activities focused on different policy, program and analytical issues. In turn, each discrete knowledge development project may have a series of written products addressed to different dimensions of the issue. For instance, all experimental demonstration projects have both process and impact evaluations, frequently undertaken by different evaluation agents. Findings will be published as they become available so that there will usually be a series of reports as evidence accumulates. To organize these products, each publication is classified in one of the twelve broad knowledge development categories, described in terms of the more specific issue, activity or cluster of activities to which it is addressed, with an identifier of the product and what it represents relative to other products in the demonstrations. Hence, the multiple products under a knowledge development activity are closely interrelated and the activites in each broad cluster have significant interconnections.

This volume should be read in conjunction with the evaluations of local YEDPA programs in the "program evaluation" category, particularly the four sets of case studies by the National Council on Employment Policy and The State Role in Youth Employment and Training Programs.

Robert Taggart
Administrator
Office of Youth Programs

## Table of Contents


| Section | Page |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Methods of Data Collection | 5 |
| The Mail Survey | 5 |
| The Regional Conferences | 7 |
| The Field Visits | 8 |
| Profile of the Small City | 14 |
| Small City Labor Markets | 14 |
| Small Cities in the CETA System | 16 |
| Major Problem Areas | 21 |
| Issues Associated with Local Job Opportunities | 21 |
| Issues Associated with Transportation | 25 |
| Issues Related to Occupational Choice | 31 |
| Issues Related to Vocational Training | 35 |
| Issues Related to Economic Development | 38 |
| Issues Related to Administrative Capacity | 42 |
| Issues Associated with the CETA Allocation Process | 47 |
| Issues Relating to the Community View of CETA | 52 |
| Issues Related to Management of the Local Economy | 57 |
| Conclusions and Policy Implications | 63 |
| Implications for the Local Delivery System | 63 |
| Implications for the Small City | 66 |
| Appendix A | 75 |
| Mail Survey of Small Cities: Methodology and Survey Tables | |
| Appendix B | 112 |
| Summaries of Model Youth Programs Operating in Small Cities | |

## Introduction

The National League of Cities (NLC) has an active interest in the problems of youth employment. Very few of the nation's cities have been untouched by the problem of youth unemployment, and NLC's concern lies in developing and implementing strategies to assist cities in addressing this complex problem.

Passage of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA) provided an opportunity for the nation's cities, as well as NLC, to explore the labor market problems of today's youth and to develop knowledge about what does and does not work in the transition of youth from school to work.

Recognizing that small cities have special labor market problems, NLC is particularly concerned about the employment and training problems of youth in these smaller communities. Therefore, one of the basic goals of NLC's Youth Employment Project is to provide recommendations to DOL's Office of Youth Programs that will help improve the delivery of CETA services to youth in small cities. In order to achieve this goal, the Youth Project attempts to identify characteristics of small cities that have particular bearing on the employment and training opportunities available to the youth who reside in those cities and who depend on the institutions of small cities to prepare them for the responsibilities of adulthood and for their participation in the labor market.

The CETA programs operating in small cities are becoming an increasingly important part of the employment and training opportunities available to youth in small and rural communities. How well the CETA program functions in small cities depends largely on the ability of the CETA delivery system to recognize and adapt to the special circumstances of small cities and small city labor market conditions. Therefore, the task of NLC's Youth Project is to identify the problems associated with implementing CETA youth programs in small cities, to examine how CETA services are being delivered to small city youth, and to define administrative and other structures under which CETA youth programs are operating in small cities.

Before recommendations can be made to enhance the delivery of CETA services to small city youth, an understanding must be developed of how decisions are made in determining what categories of youth are identified as most in need of CETA services, what services and program activities are to be provided to meet these needs, how services are to be provided, and who is to provide them.

As part of this effort, the NLC Youth Employment Project is designed to create a knowledge base about CETA youth programs in small and rural communities that will accomplish three primary objectives:

1. Provide a profile of the small city in CETA youth program operations;

2. Identify the kinds of problems that affect the delivery of CETA services to small city youth; and

3. Examine the CETA administrative structures that determine how planning decisions are make and who makes them.

A secondary objective of the Project is to identify and describe a number of model youth programs operating in small city environments. In addition, examples of noteworthy features of programs are provided in cases where an interesting or innovative approach was taken by a local program operator in addressing the problems of providing services to youth in small and rural cities.

The basic primise of the Project is that small cities, because they are small, will have some unique characteristics that bear on the design and implementation of CETA youth programs in small and rural communities. By identifying these characteristics and relating them to the structure and function of the CETA program, an assessment can be made of the efficiency with which the CETA system accommodates these special small city circumstances. From this assessment, recommendations can then be made to improve the delivery of CETA services to youth in small cities and rural communities.

In this context, this final report will draw on the data base created by each of the three complimentary project activities to define the nature of the

problems associated with planning small city youth programs, to discuss the implications of these issues for CETA operations, and to suggest administrative and legislative remedies for some of these problems.

This report is organized into four major sections. The first section describes the project activities and outlines the methodology used in developing the data base. The second section provides a statistical profile of the small city in CETA youth operations and is based largely on data generated by a nation-wide survey of small cities. The third section discusses the characteristics of small cities that affect the planning and implementing of CETA youth programs and examines some of the problems of program administration in small and rural communities. The final section attempts to draw some general conclusions from the project data and offers some recommendations that may enhance the delivery of CETA youth services to youth in small cities.

Two appendices are also included in this report. The methodology and statistical tables of the mail survey of small cities is contained in Appendix A; while Appendix B provides the summaries of the model youth programs operating in small and rural cities.

## Methods of Data Collection

The data for this project were derived from three kinds of project activities: (1) a nation-wide mail survey of NLC member cities with populations bewteen 25,000 and 75,000 persons; (2) a series of four regional conferences; and (3) field visits to small cities in each of the ten Department of Labor regions.

### The Mail Survey

In August of 1979, a mail questionnaire was sent to approximately 536 NLC member cities with populations of 75,000 or less. The primary purpose of the mail questionnaire was to establish a data base for identifying problems that are unique to smaller cities and rural communities in planning and implementing CETA youth programs and to determine the role that small cities play in CETA youth program operations at the local level. Of the 536 questionnaires mailed, 300 were returned, for a response rate of 56%. Of these 300, approximately 79% (236) were completed by cities which did not have contractual responsibility for the complete planning and implementing of CETA youth programs, although these cities did serve as work or training sites in most cases. The remaining 21% (64) were completed by cities which were subgrantees of CETA prime sponsors

the operation of part or all of the local CETA youth programs. Subgrantee cities, in most cases, were those cities that receive administrative funds for operating youth programs and had contractual obligations for the expenditure of funds and the provision of services, as well as for meeting specific performance goals.

Questions included in the survey were selected using several different criteria. First, a review of the literature suggested a number of problem areas that might be associated with planning and implementing CETA youth programs in small cities and rural communities. However, in addition to identifying CETA operational problems and barriers to employment faced by youth in small cities, survey questions were designed to provide information about how services are delivered, what types of agencies are selected to deliver services, and what CETA services are provided to youth in small cities. Moreover, questions were included that would provide data relating to the planning and policy-making process as well as the delivery system. Finally, the survey incorporated questions that would define the role of the small city in both the planning and operating of CETA youth programs and that would identify the major concerns of small cities in local program operations.

In establishing the validity of the mail survey data base, the most serious

concerns were related to non-sampling bias and geographical bias. However, using the city population restrictions mentioned above (i.e., 25-75,000), the NLC sample represented a 73% sample of all cities in that population range. This large sample size, coupled with a response rate of 56%, effectively minimized the bias associated with non-random sampling. Moreover, an examination of the regional dispersion of the NLC sample cities showed that only one region, Region I, was slightly over-represented in the sample. However, since the small cities in Region I represented only about 11% of all small cities nation-wide, and because the degree of over-representation was so small, the effect of the bias on the total sample was probably minimal. (A detailed explanation of survey methodology is found in Appendix A.)

The Regional Conferences

Regional conferences on youth employment in small cities were conducted in Raleigh, North Carolina (9/79), Danvers, Massachusetts (12/79), Kansas City, Missouri (1/80), and San Francisco, California (2/80).

These conferences were designed to attract a variety of local officials and administrators involved with the implementation of CETA youth programs in small cities and rural communities. In order of their priority for participation, these target groups included: (1) CETA youth staff from small cities,

(2) elected officials from small cities operating CETA youth programs, (3) representatives from small cities not operating programs, (4) representatives from community-based organizations (CBOs) serving small city youth, and (5) CETA prime sponsor staff serving small cities. In addition to these groups, members from local CETA planning councils attended, in some cases, as well as youth participants from small cities.

Generally, the conferences were well-attended, with 35-50 participants at each conference. Discussions among conference participants focused on the role of the small city in youth program planning and implementation, operational problems associated with small city CETA youth programs, and recommendations for improving the delivery of youth services in small and rural cities.

The Field Visits

Field visits to local youth programs in small cities were conducted in each of the ten Department of Labor (DOL) regions. A total of 15 site visits were conducted between August, 1979, and January, 1980. Field visits were designed primarily to accomplish three basic objectives:

1. To identify model youth programs, or exemplary features of programs, that are serving small cities and rural communities;
2. To identify critical issues and problem areas associated with planning and implementing CETA youth programs in small and rural communities; and

3. To gather information that expands or compliments the data base generated by NLC's mail questionnaire to small cities.

Generally, each field visit to a small city was conducted over a two-day period. During the visit, a variety of individuals were interviewed, including representatives from local governments, prime sponsors, local program operators, community-based organizations, local employment and training agencies, and youth program participants. From these interviews, a body of knowledge was developed which underscores a number of issues that bear on the effectiveness of CETA youth programs serving small and rural cities.

Small cities were selected for site visits on the basis of several factors, including the following: (1) type of prime sponsor serving the small city, (2) whether or not the small city was a youth program operator, (3) whether or not the small city was in a metropolitan or non-metropolitan setting, and (4) the geographic location of the small city. The aggregate profile of the small cities visited in terms of these criteria generally coincided with the aggregate profile of small cities developed by the National League of Cities' mail survey of small cities.

Below are listed all of the small cities visited, together with the local program operator and the appropriate prime sponsor.

| City/Program Operator/Prime Sponsor | DOL Region | Population |
|---|---|---|
| Weymouth, MA<br>Weymouth Youth Office<br>BOS Massachusetts | I | 56,263 |
| Plainfield, NJ<br>Plainfield Public Works & Urban Development Department<br>Union County | II | 43,501 |
| North Tonawanda, NY<br>Niagara County Manpower Development and Training Department<br>Niagara County | II | 39,881 |
| Altoona, PA<br>Southern Alleghenies Consortium<br>Southern Alleghenies Planning and Development Commission | III | 59,067 |
| Greenville, MS<br>Washington-Issaquena-Sharkey CAA<br>BOS Mississippi | IV | 42,839 |
| Charleston, SC<br>Charleston (City) Employment and Training Department<br>Charleston County (FY80)<br>State of South Carolina (FY79) | IV | 60,772 |
| Highland Park, IL<br>Highland Park Youth Center<br>Cook County | V | 31,412 |
| Mansfield, OH<br>Mansfield CETA Program<br>Richland-Morrow Consortium | V | 56,729 |

| City/Program Operator/Prime Sponsor | DOL Region | Population |
|---|---|---|
| Harlingen, TX<br>Cameron County CETA<br>Cameron County | VI | 40,824 |
| Killeen/Temple, TX<br>Central Texas Manpower Consortium<br>Central Texas Manpower Consortium | VI | 50,628/39,473 |
| Ames, IA<br>County of Story<br>Central Iowa Regional Association of Local Governments | VII | 44,158 |
| Medina/Glen Ullin, ND<br>Bureau of Employment Security<br>State of North Dakota | VIII | 300/400 (est.) |
| La Habra, CA<br>La Habra Employment and Training Department<br>Orange County Manpower Commission | IX | 43,358 |
| Visalia, CA<br>Tulare County Human Services<br>Tulare County | IX | 38,189 |
| American Falls/Lewiston, ID<br>American Falls School District No. 381/Lewis-Clark State College<br>Idaho Manpower Consortium | X | 3,208/26,068 |

Basically, the issues for discussion during the on-site visits were developed through a variety of sources. Initially, a review of the literature on topics related to small city labor markets and rural educational problems suggested a

foundation of issues that would be relevant to the interview process. This foundation was then developed further by issues raised by program operators during the on-site visits themselves and by areas of concern identified during other phases of the project, such as the regional conferences and the flow of information generated by the mail survey.

The bulk of these issues are related to variables that stem from characteristics that are unique to small cities. Geographic remoteness, relatively small local governmental organizations, lack of or limited transportation, narrow economic bases, low population densities, and relatively limited social and economic resources are all factors which create special problems for local officials who are planning and implementing CETA youth programs for small cities and rural communities.

However, another set of issues is related more to administrative factors that affect the way CETA youth funds are allocated to small cities and local program operators, and that determine the way in which CETA services are delivered to youth in small cities. Perhaps the single most critical factor bearing on the success of CETA youth programs in small and rural cities is the degree of commitment from local officials. If small city officials or local program operators are committed to the programs, then the programs are generally successful. Therefore, the ways in which money and information

are directed to small city officials and the administrative framework within which they must plan and implement CETA youth programs are extremely important elements in determining the degree of commitment local officials are willing to make to CETA youth programs.

## Profile of the Small City

### Small City Labor Markets

Small cities, because they are small, tend to have unique characteristics that often present special problems for program planners and operators who are charged with the task of implementing CETA youth programs in small cities. Small city populations tend to be comprised mostly of very young and older persons, while those in the prime age categories, who usually have more education, more ambition, and more skill, tend to leave the small city for places where more opportunity is perceived. As one local official stated: "Most of the young people here tend to be school aged. Not considering those younger than 18, the average age is 46 years old. Once they graduate, a lot of the young people leave."

Small city labor markets tend to be dominated by small employers, in many cases family-oriented businesses. Occupational choices in the local labor market may be limited to low-wage, low-skilled positions in retail trade or service industries. The local economy may rely heavily on agricultural production or on the light manufacture or processing of agricultural goods. In some cases, the health of the local economy may be tied to the well-being

of a single large employer in the area. Small cities tend to have fewer resources at their disposal for promoting human development and economic growth; and what resources are available tend to be geographically dispersed. As a result, shifting budgetary priorities at the federal level, a bad crop, a plant closing or relocation, or an economic downturn may mean disaster for a small city economy. Consequently, local officials in small cities tend to be especially concerned about factors or issues that may impact on the health of the local economy and about their ability to manage local labor markets.

Small cities generally lack public transportation systems; and those that do exist may be limited in their operation or the area that they serve. Small cities may be geographically remote and, therefore, isolated from major centers of economic activity. Poor highways, lack of convenient air or rail transportation, and lack of public transportation may also hamper local efforts to attract new industry to the area or may contribute to the demise of existing small businesses. Small city governmental organizations may not offer a full range of public services because of a limited tax base, which further contributes to the narrow occupational choices and limited employment opportunities available to small city youth.

Small Cities in the CETA System

Small cities, because of their population size, are not eligible to receive direct CETA grants from the Department of Labor (DOL) as CETA prime sponsors. Therefore, small cities, to the extent that they are involved in local CETA operations, must access the CETA system through the prime sponsor in whose jurisdiction the small city is located.

In general, small cities tend not to be operators of CETA youth programs. Only about 21% of the nation's small cities are operating CETA youth programs under subgrant arrangements with their prime sponsors; the remaining 79% either act as work sites or do not actively participate in the CETA programs.

Small cities may be served by a wide variety of prime sponsor arrangements under the CETA system: a single-county prime, a variety of local consortia comprised of both cities and counties, a balance-of-state prime sponsor, or state consortium. As a result, if a small city wants to participate in program planning, operations, or policy development or wishes to obtain information about local CETA resources, the small city must appeal to one of three basic prime sponsor arrangements: a single-county prime, where the small city must appeal to its county government; a local consortium, where the small city must appeal to a consortia board comprised of county and, in some cases, big-city elected officials; or a state-administered prime sponsorship, where the small

city must appeal to either state officials or a state-wide consortia board comprised of state and local officials. How the prime sponsor is organized, the administrative structure created by the prime to implement the programs, and the structure and function of the CETA advisory council are critical to the small city's ability to gain information about what CETA resources are available locally, to obtain information about the regulations and guidelines that govern how CETA resources can be used, to participate in the development of CETA policies that impact on the city, and to apply for and receive CETA subgrants.

Of the three basic prime sponsor categories, 46% of the small cities surveyed are served by single-county primes; 20% by local consortia; and 34% by state-administered prime sponsors. The type of prime sponsor a small city is served by seems to make a big difference in the role the small city plays in local CETA operations.

Small cities served by local consortia seem to play the most active role in operating programs and in sitting on CETA advisory councils and participating in local policy development. Moreover, these small cities indicate a greater satisfaction with local CETA operations. In contrast,

small cities served by single-county primes seem to experience the greatest degree of dissatisfaction, are less likely to operate youth programs, have the least opportunity to sit on CETA planning councils and are the most likely to have no participation in the development of local CETA policies.

Perhaps the most disconcerting aspect of the small city's role in local CETA operations is that 38% of the small cities have no participation at all in the development of local CETA policies, and another 23% have only informal means of influencing how CETA resources are used in serving the city's youth. Small cities served by single-county prime sponsors and small cities with population of less than 50,000 seem to be the most likely to have no participation in local policy development.

The most likely deliverer of service to youth in small cities tends to be the prime sponsor itself. In 37% of the cases, small cities are served directly by their prime sponsor. However, the second most likely service deliverer is the small city itself, with 21% of all small cities operating their own youth programs under a subgrant arrangement with their prime. Community-based organizations (CBOs) serve 12% of the small cities, while 9% are served by other governmental organizations, such as counties or other cities. The

remaining 21% are served by either schools, local offices of the state employment service, or other agencies. State-administered primes are the least likely to operate programs directly, which is not surprising in view of the large jurisdictions states must serve. State primes tend to rely more heavily on CBOs to deliver services to small city youth. Survey results indicate that state primes use CBOs three times more frequently than single county or local consortia primes to deliver youth services to small cities within their jurisdictions. However, state primes are the least likely to subgrant to small cities for youth program operations.

Because state primes generally serve a very large geographical area, there may be a tendency to subgrant to counties or regional entities which can serve a larger jurisdiction. As a result, the state prime can cover its jurisdiction with the least number of subgrants. In contrast, local consortia boards may be more inclined to subgrant to small cities, since the consortia jurisdictions are smaller and the population is more likely to be concentrated in their cities.

One of the most revealing results of the small city survey is that only 21% of the small cities have direct control of the youth programs operating in their

cities and serving their youth. Given the concern small city officials have expressed in terms of the migration of youth out of the small cities, it may seem surprising that they seem to have such minimal control over CETA youth resources.

For the remaining 79% of the small cities, which do not operate CETA youth programs, local youth are served by some other entity, which suggests that small cities may have few opportunities to influence how youth programs are operated in their cities, what priority groups are targeted for service, what program services and activities are available locally, and how CETA resources are allocated. The profile of small cities also suggests that, because there is such a wide variety of local program operators serving small cities, the ability of the small city to understand the local CETA system may be significantly impaired. From the perspective of the small city, local officials may find it extremely difficult to ferret out which local agency has ultimate responsibility for administration of the youth programs. Moreover, because small cities are served under a variety of prime sponsor arrangements and by a variety of local programs operators, it is difficult for small cities to compare experiences and to share problems and solutions.

## Major Problem Areas

### Issues Associated with Local Job Opportunities

An issue that was central to youth program operations in all of the sites visited was one related to the availability of suitable employment opportunities in the local labor market, both in the public sector and the private sector.

Small city labor markets tend to be characterized largely by service industries or retail trade establishments. As a result, the local economy is usually comprised of a large number of small business establishments that employ primarily low-wage, low-skill occupations. Most of the small cities visited were able to boast of at least one or two "major" employers located either in the city or within commuting distance. However, to the extent that large employers exist, these industries were generally oriented toward manufacturing or processing agricultural products or extracting minerals. In some cases, the major employer was a service oriented organization, such as a post-secondary school or a federal or state agency.

As a result, economically disadvantaged youth in small cities tend to be faced

with a narrow range of employment opportunities. If they choose to remain in the small city, economically disadvantaged youth generally must decide among several alternatives: (1) to work in the local public sector, which usually means taking a job in a general labor, maintenance or clerical field, unless the youth is willing and financially able to pursue a college degree; (2) to pursue a job with a local small business establishment, which usually means taking a job in a low-wage, low-skill service or retail trade occupation; (3) to pursue employment with a large industry in the area, if one exists, which may generally mean a job with a higher wage, but with low skill, limited upward mobility, and limited entry opportunities because of local competition; or (4) if the economy is agriculturally-based, to become a farm laborer, which may provide only seasonal work.

On the other hand, if the small city youth finds these basic alternatives unacceptable and decides to leave the local labor market, then a number of problems present themselves: (1) financing the migration, (2) adjusting to a different social and economic environment, and (3) obtaining appropriate occupational skills. Moreover, local program operators in small cities report that the decision by youth to migrate is frequently based on imperfect labor market information and youth are often ill-prepared for the transition.

This set of circumstances creates two major problems for small city CETA youth programs, one relating to the development of career plans and the other relating to job development. Small city youth and their CETA counselors find that they must make some difficult decisions in negotiating an Employability Development Plan (EDP). As one counselor states: "Young people come in and say they need a job that pays $4.00 or $5.00 an hour. We have to tell them that the only way they can do that here is to go to work for (name of railroad); and if they don't want to do that, then they have to work here in town or else go where jobs pay more." Counselors must confront economically disadvantaged youth with the hard realities of small city labor markets: there is only a limited scope of jobs available to them in the small city labor market. If they aspire to certain types of occupations, there may very well be no local labor market. Consequently, if youth wish to pursue such a career, they must be prepared to leave the area. While the local CETA program may be able to prepare youth for migration from an occupational perspective, local programs often complain that their programs are not geared to providing services that can facilitate the actual migration process. Counselors and program administrators then, are frequently faced with the basic problem of either training local youth for jobs that are relevant to the small city labor market or training youth for occupations that require the youth to migrate in order to find work in the chosen vocation.

Even for training programs that cater to the kinds of occupations that are saleable in the local labor market, job development in the small city environment is a particularly troublesome problem and represents a major concern within the local community, as well as CETA staff and youth participants. One local administrator expresses the problem this way: "We can't put youth into work experience or classroom training programs without some realistic expectation that they can get jobs after they complete the program. Otherwise, we are creating false hope for the young people, and we are wasting the taxpayer's money." Many program operators feel that the types of occupational skills that could be imparted to youth in public sector work experience programs are sometimes not appropriate for private sector jobs because work in the public sector tends to be service-oriented while many job opportunities in the private sector are oriented to an industrial production setting.

Youth program operators in small cities also find that, in some cases, they are precluded from offering youth a continuum of occupational services because the CETA delivery system tends to be fragmented. While a small city or a community-based organization may operate CETA youth programs, Title II-B and PSE programs may more likely be operated directly by the prime sponsor or by another subgrantee. As a result, youth program staff may be quite knowledgeable about youth program eligibility, but may know very little about PSE or other CETA program eligibility or other guidelines. Therefore, efforts by youth

counselors to tranfer youth from Title IV programs to other titles may be frustrated because eligibility for other programs was not taken into consideration at the initial intake point. As a result, small city youth programs may find it difficult to provide a logical sequence of career development services to their youth participants, which further exacerbates the job development problem.

The difficulties associated with finding suitable employment opportunities in the small city labor market become more critical when youth program administrators find that they can not rely on other CETA programs to continue the occupational development initiated under the local youth program.

Issues Associated with Transportation

Many small cities and rural communities find that lack of transportation is a major concern in the planning and implementing of CETA youth programs. Public transportation in small and rural cities is generally characterized by one of two situations: (1) there is no public transportation system, or (2) a public transportation system exists, but it often does not meet the needs of the local CETA program.

In those small cities where public transportation systems were in operation, local CETA program operators usually cited a number of inadequacies: (1) the

designated transportation routes did not coincide with the needs of CETA youth participants; (2) the transportation schedules and hours of operation were not conducive to employment-oriented activities; or (3) the transportation routes did not change with the movements of the local industrial hubs. Local youth program operators in one small city complained that the local buses seemed to be geared more toward local commercial interests, taking shoppers from the residential area to the shopping centers and recreational activities, rather than to the needs of the labor force. Not only did the buses not serve many of the industrial areas of the local labor market, but the hours of operation and the frequency of the schedules did not lend themselves to a work-oriented ridership. In another small city, youth counselors also pointed out that economically disadvantaged youth sometimes need education about how the local transportation system worked: hours of operation, how to read a schedule, how a bus transfer works, location of stops, and the fare schedule.

These kinds of problems have a number of implications for small city CETA programs. Perhaps the most immediate problem created by lack of transportation or inadequate transportation in small cities is the problem of matching CETA youth with work and training sites. Local youth program operators reported that they could not assume the availability of transportation when matching economically

disadvantaged youth with CETA work or training sites. Small cities and other local youth program operators find that, in order to provide the widest range of occupational training, they must use work sites and training facilities that may be dispersed over a large area. This is particularly true of vocational training facilities which usually serve large, multi-county regions in less-densely populated areas. Many small city youth counselors also report that they can offer only limited work sites for some occupations and, therefore, do not have much flexibility in work site selection. For example, if a small city youth wants to pursue a career in a health occupation, the county hospital may be the only public sector work site. However, the county hospital may be in another town, requiring the CETA youth to have some form of transportation.

In other cases, because of the administrative policies of the prime sponsor and other local circumstances, small cities that operate CETA youth programs may be required to serve youth in surrounding small cities as well as their local youth. For example, in three of the site visits, small city program operators were required by their subgrants to serve neighboring cities in addition to the residents of their own municipalities. As a result, transportation was seen as an essential ingredient to the effective placement of youth clients due to the size of geographic area involved and the limited flexibility in selecting work and

training sites. In negotiating employability development plans (EDPs) with youth, counselors had to be particularly sensitive to the youths' access to transportation. For a youth who aspires to the career of a mechanic, working in the county garage may offer an ideal training opportunity; but a 40 mile roundtrip journey to work may preclude the realization of that opportunity unless transportation arrangements can be made. Similarly, area vocational technical schools or local offices of the state employment service which serve large geographic regions may be inaccessible to small city youth and, as a result, frustrate the development and implementation of EDPs because of lack of transportation.

Transportation also asserts itself as a problem in other aspects of small city youth operations. Many essential program activities, such as outreach, recruitment, and program monitoring and evaluation, are hampered by lack of transportation in small cities. In those cases where small cities and other local program operators must serve large geographic areas, economically disadvantaged youth may have difficulty getting to intake centers. As a result, local program staff are hampered in their efforts to reach youth in the outlying areas of their jurisdiction. Moreover, youth counselors and monitoring staff may find it particularly expensive and time-consuming to visit work and training sites or to respond to calls requiring emergency assistance. Agency vehicles, if they exist,

are generally limited in number and are often used for a number of purposes. Utilization of personal vehicles is an alternative, but small cities may not have the most lucrative reimbursement policies and insurance liability problems may discourage staff from using their personal vehicles for transporting youth clients. In the sites visited, small city programs generally had only limited means of dealing with these kinds of transportation problems: (1) payment of transportation allowance, (2) car pooling, (3) creation of mobile units or "circuit riders", and (4) linkages with transportation programs of other agencies. However, none of these remedies were reported as adequate by the local program operators. To be effective, transportation allowances require that the youth have a car or that an adequate public transportation system be in operation. More often than not, small city CETA counselors complained that the payment of transportation allowances did not alleviate the problems of matching youth with jobs and training opportunities.

While car pooling seemed to be more favorably reported, it too, had problems. First, counselors had difficulty coordinating a car pooling system. Frequently, work or training schedules did not coincide sufficiently, causing inconvenience and, sometimes, unacceptable levels of tardiness. Dependability was also mentioned as a problem with car pooling, since the fate of all riders rested with the driver.

A number of the programs visited attempted to overcome some of their transportation problems by creating some form of mobile unit or "circuit rider" system. In order to reach those youth who could not be served through the regular intake system, some local programs attempted to take the services to the youth. In some cases, a mobile unit would visit specific locations on a periodic schedule; in other cases, a single individual would be employed to staff a satellite office or visit certain cities or schools on a fixed schedule. Services provided by this method were usually limited to intake, assessment, and counseling; and local program operators also pointed out that this type of service delivery did not lend itself to crisis or emergency situations and that the capacity to provide a full range of services was limited.

In some cases, local CETA programs attempted to resolve their transportation problems by creating linkages with other local transportation programs. In addition to area school buses, special purpose programs, such as seniors or handicapped, may offer limited transportation services to their clientele. Several CETA program operators related various problems which frustrated their efforts to negotiate with these programs for transportation: "turf" protection, liability insurance, routing and schedule changes, sharing of capital and operating expenses, and establishing priorities for service.

While the Non-Urbanized Public Transportation Program (Section 18 of the Surface Transportation Act of 1978) attempted to resolve these kinds of problems and eliminate the duplication and lack of coordination among special purpose transportation programs in non-metropolitan areas, local officials had little or no knowledge of this program. Given the importance of transportation to small city CETA programs, more intense promotional efforts of the Section 18 Transportation Program might be undertaken. Lack of transportation is a problem that plagues local program operators every day and represents a major obstruction to the effective implementation of CETA youth programs in small and rural cities.

Issues Related to Occupational Choice

Under the CETA system, local youth program operators have, basically, three avenues for providing subsidized employment opportunities to economically disadvantaged youth: through local public agencies; through private, non-profit organizations; and through private sector establishments. Consequently, the variety of occupational choices available through these local institutions defines the scope of occupational training that small city CETA programs can offer their youth. As suggested by the on-site visits, small city public and private sectors tend to be characterized by some special traits which limit

their ability to provide a wide range of occupational choice to local economically disadvantaged youth.

In some of the smaller cities visited, the local government was not a full-service government and employed only a narrow range of occupations. Usually, this meant that the city was able to offer only traditional maintenance or clerical occupations as training positions. Other public agencies, such as schools or special districts, were also small and, therefore, limited in their occupational offerings as well.

Many local program operators also reported that there were few private, non-profit agencies located in their small cities. Those non-profit organizations that did exist tended to be staffed by only a few full-time employees, usually professional, with either part-time or volunteer workers completing the personnel roster. As a work or training site, these agencies suffered not only from an extremely narrow occupational scope, but also from a limited capacity for supervision. Local CETA youth programs also complained that the small private, non-profit organizations were generally the least likely to be able to supply materials or equipment for YCCIP projects. Consequently, the small city non-profit organizations were not looked upon as potential

youth project operators. This problem was compounded by the financial instability of these agencies. If a private, non-profit organization was monitored and found to have misused CETA funds, the local program operator usually had little hope of recovering the money. Or, if a youth was placed in a private, non-profit organization as a work or training site, there was little expectation of transition or career development. Consequently, the non-profit sector was not generally looked upon as a resource for occupational training, and the requirement of the CETA regulations to give preference to these community-based organizations was usually a source of consternation.

By the same token, private sector establishments in small cities also pose certain problems to local CETA youth program operators. For the most part, the small city labor market tends to be dominated by very small retail and service industries, many of which may be family-oriented. As a result, the small city private sector may consist largely of low-skilled, low-wage occupations, such as laborer, cashier, waitress, clerk-typist, retail clerk, maid, or fast-food cook. Again, the scope of private sector occupations tends to be very narrow, and CETA youth counselors in small cities often report that the local labor market does not provide them with the occupational resources to accommodate the career planning needs of small city youth.

Moreover, private sector employment opportunities may be over-represented by agriculture or agriculture-related industries. Consequently, many of the occupations in the small city labor market may be associated with seasonal farm labor or with the manufacture or processing of agricultural products.

To the extent that large manufacturing industries exist in small cities, the local labor market may be dominated by one or two large employers. As a result, wages may be considerably higher but local competition or FLSA standards usually put CETA-eligible youth at a disadvantage in applying for those jobs. Where the manufacturing is related to the processing of agricultural products, occupations are likely to be low-skill assembly-line jobs that may also be hazardous, unpleasant, or seasonal.

The basic conclusion, then, is that youth in small cities do not have access to a wide range of occupational choice in either the public or the private sector of the local labor market. As a result, CETA youth programs are limited in their ability to provide the variety of occupational training and exposure that could be offered in a larger city with a more diversified economic base; and CETA youth counselors in small cities often find themselves placing young men in general maintenance and young women in clerical work experience positions because that is all that is available. While these work sites may

be adequate for teaching work discipline, punctuality, dependability, and other good work habits, they provide only limited opportunity for career exploration or occupational development.

Issues Related to Vocational Training

The delivery system for vocational training in the environment of small cities tends to be structured around either consolidated high schools or area vocational technical schools. As a result, vocational training services are usually provided to youth who attend the high schools or who commute from smaller schools in the region. Area vocational technical schools also seem to serve the immediate youth population, even though the school's jurisdiction may be a large, multi-county area. In either case, youth who do not live in the immediate area of the school must sometimes travel great distances in order to take advantage of the vocational training offerings. Consequently, CETA youth programs in small cities that are not located in close proximity to a vocational training center usually find it very difficult to provide vocational training. Youth must be willing to invest considerable time, expense, and effort in order to attend, and transportation becomes an important factor in determining accessibility.

The regional character of vocational training in small cities also carries

with it another significant implication for CETA youth programs. Vocational education institutions serving a large regional area may adopt enrollment policies that limit the degree of participation by local CETA program operators. For example, in one city visited, the area vocational training school, in an attempt to serve its region equitably, placed enrollment limits on the number of persons it would accept from each city in its jurisdiction. As a result, the small city was assigned a quota in each occupational program. Once the city's CETA program filled its quota in any given occupational area, no more referrals could be made unless there was a drop out or other vacancy. Consequently, programming vocational training was extremely problematic and frustrating for the small city's CETA staff.

The site visits produced a consensus in a number of other areas regarding the adequacy of vocational training in small and rural cities:

1. The types of vocational training institutions that small cities have access to offer occupational programs that are usually limited in scope. In some cases, there may be only a few occupational programs offered; while in other cases, the types or levels of training offered may not necessarily coincide with those needed by the local youth population. Local program operators point out that lack of funding and the high cost of purchasing new or modern training equipment as the reasons for inadequacies in local vocational programs. These problems seem to be especially critical in the less densely populated areas where enrollments are low and incidence of poverty high.

2. Some small cities visited cited characteristics of the small city as

contributing to problems with the quality of vocational education. For example, some program operators felt that vocational training is not that beneficial to the career development of youth unless it can be coupled with work or "hands on" opportunities. However, they went on to point out that there were few unions or apprenticeship programs in the area, and CETA work experience opportunities in some of the occupational programs were unavailable in public sector agencies. The only alternative to public sector work experience was the private sector on-the-job training, and it was very difficult to persuade local small business establishments to participate without 100% subsidation of the youths' wages.

3. The fact that many youth tend to leave the small city also contributes indirectly to small city vocational training problems. In some cases, small city CETA programs feel that the vocational offerings are not geared to occupations with local stability. Vocational curricula seemed to be oriented toward occupations that would require local youth to leave the local labor market in order to get jobs.

   In one field visit, local CETA program staff cited an example of the area vocational school not offering an occupational program in a technical occupation which was highly saleable in the local economy. As a result, the CETA program had to make arrangements to send the youth out of the area for the training, which resulted in a much higher per-participant cost as well as other administrative problems.

4. Linkages between local CETA programs in small cities and area vocational technical schools tend to be more complicated to establish. Basically, small city CETA programs have three alternatives for funding vocational training services: (a) they can fund a special class in its entirety; (b) they can refer youth to existing classes; or (c) they can participate in open-entry/open-exit occupational programs. Generally, in a small city setting, vocational schools seem to encourage the local CETA programs to fund an entire class in a given occupation, since this situation is the most administratively feasible from the school's point of view. However, local CETA programs usually balk at funding an entire class of welders, for example, because of problems with local demand; CETA staff would have great difficulty finding enough CETA-eligible youth who all wanted to be welders at the same time and then placing an entire graduating class upon completion of the program. Consequently, small city CETA programs generally prefer

open-entry/open-exist programs or referring to existing classes. These referral methods make better programming sense to local CETA programs, but, at the same time, create another set of problems. Some vocational schools object to mixing CETA-funded enrollees with non-CETA enrollees because of CETA allowance payments. Paying some students while not paying others has the potential of creating classroom problems that school administrators prefer to avoid. Also, mixing CETA and non-CETA students in the same classroom may create problems in establishing the share of training costs chargeable to CETA. Ensuring that CETA-funded supplies or classroom materials are not used by the school for non-CETA students, for example, creates an extra burden for the local CETA program.

As a result of these problems, small city CETA programs sometimes find vocational training negotiations both difficult and troublesome; and often, the final outcome is not completely satisfying to either party involved. Schools welcome the CETA referrals but balk at the terms of the linkage; the local CETA programs are eager to provide vocational training but lament the lack of curricula, problems with scheduling, and the conditions of administration; and the youth are often required to travel long distances, train on obsolete equipment, and worry about getting a job upon graduation.

Issues Related to Economic Development

Recognizing many of the problems associated with operating employment and training programs for youth in small cities, local CETA program operators may look to economic development as a way to create new jobs and bolster the local economy. Job creation and economic development activities would certainly alleviate many

of the problems associated with lack of occupational choice and employment opportunities in small cities and would improve prospects for involving local private sector establishments in small city CETA programs by stabilizing the local economy.

However, local officials and CETA program operators in small cities pointed out a number of barriers to fostering economic development in a small city environment, especially in those cities that tend to be geographically isolated. When considering the site of a small city for location, an industry evaluates the small city, among other things, in three areas: (1) the costs associated with transporting materials into and products out of the city; (2) the availability of a trained work force; and (3) the capacity of the city to meet the service needs of the industry and its work force, for example, in terms of water, housing, sewage and waste disposal, schools, energy, and a range of municipal services. As a result, small cities may have a great deal of difficulty in attracting new industries or businesses to the area.

The small city may be geographically remote and generally inaccessible by major highways, railroads, or airlines. In one field visit, the local CETA program operator had become seriously involved with linking CETA activities with a larger economic development program. One of the most serious problems was the poor

conditions of the highways in the area. Industries that relied heavily on road transportation were particularly repelled by the condition of the highways, in-spite of the many positive attributes the city had to offer.

CETA programs can be particularly relevant to the promotion of economic development in that CETA can provide the immediate resources with which small cities can establish a trained local work force. Small cities, however, point out that the availability of CETA funds does not, in itself, insure the capacity to provide the right kinds of training. Problems associated with vocational training institutions, area public schools, transportation and local public and private sector employment opportunities in small cities may preclude the effective use of CETA resources for training purposes. Moreover, in most cases, small city officials do not have direct control over how CETA funds are utilized in the area, since small cities are not eligible for prime sponsorships. Consequently, local officials in small cities have difficulty in influencing how training funds are used, how private sector CETA programs are organized, and how local CETA policies and priorities are established.

In terms of promoting economic development in small cities, one of the strongest feelings expressed by local officials was the necessity for the local officials to be able to control economic development activities. Because of the

potentially devastating effects economic development can have for small cities in terms of the community's identity, the demand for municipal services, and the effects on their environment, small city local officials find it difficult to support economic development programs that are not locally-based.

Additionally, local officials in small cities claim that they are at a disadvantage in creating economic development programs for a variety of reasons:

1. Small cities are often limited on their capacity for advance planning; lack of socio-economic data hampers attempts to analyze the local labor market and predict future economic trends; and small city organizational structures may not be geared to sophisticated economic planning;

2. Small cities are often at a disadvantage in tapping federal resources that can be used for economic development; for example, under the Housing and Community Development Act (HCDA), cities with less than 50,000 population are not guaranteed formula grants like larger cities; consequently, smaller cities can receive HCDA grants only through competitive bidding. Also, Non-Urbanized Public Transportation funds (Section 18 of the Surface Transportation Act of 1978) allocates funds to States, which means that state policies determine how readily small cities can access vital transportation monies; some states have chosen to allocate funds only to counties or other entities, so small cities are precluded from direct grants. Similarly, the vocational education allocation system and planning process is basically a State-Local Education Agency process which excludes the small city official. Planning and coordinating a comprehensive economic development program presents the small city official with what may seem to be insurmountable problems when the local elected official has no direct access to resources such as CETA, HCDA, Section 18, on vocational education.

3. Small city officials, in many cases, are unaware of what resources are available for economic development purposes and do not have sufficient information about how to go about the task of applying for these resources. Capacity-building is an important consideration in promoting

economic development in small cities; local officials need not only the right information, but also the ability to use the information effectively once they obtain it.

Local CETA program operations often look to economic development as an answer to many of their employment-related problems, but the link between CETA resources and economic development activities is not always readily apparent. CETA funds do not always come to small cities in ways that can be most useful to them; information about other CETA components does not always filter down to the small city level; and decentralization of CETA planning and decision-making often eludes local elected officials in small cities. Consequently, promotion of economic development and linkage with CETA activities is a particularly difficult task in small cities and rural communities.

Issues Related to Administrative Capacity

Local officials in many small and rural cities may be charged with the responsibility of managing a number of areas in city business; in some of the smaller towns, elected officials and even some of the administrative personnel may be only part-time employees. Smaller cities may also have a narrow organizational scope, lacking, for example, planning or personnel departments or a human service delivery system.

When small cities are characterized by these circumstances, their ability to

function within the CETA system may be significantly impaired for a number of reasons. For example, the small city will, generally, not have an administrative structure in place that can manage the planning and application for a CETA youth subgrant or that could operate the program if the application is approved. Since the city may be providing only the basic municipal services, such as police and fire protection or public works, the city administration can not readily create the organizational structure to meet the restrictive time frames of a CETA request-for-proposal (RFP). Responding successfully to a CETA prime sponsor's RFP may require gathering socioeconomic data, establishing linkages and program plans with local schools or other youth-serving agencies, preparing a subgrant package, and following the application through the prime's planning process. Local officials whose positions are part time or city employees who have prime responsibilities in a variety of the city's functional areas are at a severe disadvantage under the CETA system in terms of time, energy, financial expense, and often, staff and office space. These problems are compounded by the observation that prime sponsors may not, in some cases, provide administrative monies to their subgrantees and that small cities generally have limited access to information about CETA programs and guidelines.

On the other hand, small cities that have a department or a staff that is designated to provide youth-oriented services, such as recreation or juvenile justice, generally are in a much better position to work within the CETA system. These cities have a youth-related organizational structure in place and can much more readily respond to the planning and administrative requirements of a CETA youth subgrant. This factor probably explains, in part, the wide variety of experience among small cities in terms of CETA youth program operations. While a small city in one area may complain that it can not manage a CETA program, another small city down the road may have a successful history of operating CETA programs as a subgrantee. Therefore, the existence of a youth-serving or a human resource oriented organizational structure within the city administration is an important factor in the city's willingness and capacity to plan and implement CETA youth programs. Otherwise, the small city may tend to be overwhelmed by the financial, administrative, and organizational demands that the CETA system places on a municipal government.

However, small cities are affected by the question of administrative capacity in another, more indirect way. The opportunities for small city participation may be more profoundly affected by the prime's administrative capacity for program management than by the small city's capacity to operate programs.

Small cities can actively participate in youth programs either as a planning partner or as a program operator. Consequently, the prime sponsor's capacity for organizational development, program planning, and subgrant management has an important bearing on the administrative policies established by the prime to execute its responsibilities under the CETA legislation; and these administrative decisions directly affect the role that small cities can play in the process. For example, a prime sponsor that is having significant organizational or administrative problems in terms of developing an adequate RFP process, maintaining appropriate fiscal auditing standards, or monitoring and evaluating subcontracts may prefer to minimize the number of subgrants it must manage. As a result, the prime may not view small cities as the primary recipients of subgrants. On the other hand, primes which have developed a greater capacity for subgrant management may be more inclined to consider small cities as either potential program operators or at least partners in planning.

Small and rural cities that do not operate CETA youth programs find that the city's youth are served by some other agency, such as a school district, a community-based organization, a regionally-based agency, the prime sponsor itself, or a local office of the state employment service. As a result,

the small city does not have direct control of CETA youth resources, and the small city's ability to influence local CETA programs and policies is dependent upon the structure and function of the prime sponsor's planning process and the prime's youth advisory council. Consequently, the small city's participation in CETA operations tends to be largely dependent on administrative decisions at the prime sponsor level.

For example, in one state, the balance-of-state (BOS) prime sponsor made a decision to subgrant only to agencies that would take responsibility for serving multi-county regions. In this way, the state's 87-county BOS jurisdiction could be completely served by 14 regional subgrantees. As a result, cities, and even counties, were precluded from program planning and operations unless they were willing to serve the designated multi-county area. In another state, the BOS prime sponsor chose to subgrant only to county governments. Under this arrangement, while a small city could not be a subgrantee of the prime, there was a possibility that the city could be a subgrantee of the county. In still another BOS program, cities were the primary recipients of subgrants as long as a city would assume the responsibility of serving surrounding municipalities. In a fourth example, a multi-county consortium decided not to subgrant to any local agencies, prefering to maximize control over program quality by operating all programs in-house.

Each of these four examples shows how small cities within the prime's jurisdiction are presented with different degrees of opportunity to participate in CETA youth operations. More often than not, these opportunities tend to be solely a function of an administrative decision made at the prime sponsor level and motivated primarily by the prime's desire to diminish the

administrative burdens associated with subgrant management rather than out of concern for the principles of decentralization--local planning, local decision-making, and local problem solving. As a result of these kinds of prime sponsor policies, the agency that operates youth programs serving small and rural cities may be far removed from the local level and may be insensitive to local needs. Small cities that do not operate youth programs directly may find it difficult to influence CETA policies because of the complexity and variety of prime sponsor administrative policies and planning procedures that surround the delivery of CETA services to youth in small and rural cities.

Issues Associated with the CETA Allocation Process

How CETA youth funds are funnelled down from the federal level to the local level appears to affect the ability of the small city to use the monies effectively and seems to determine, to some extent, how services are delivered to small city youth.

One of the most basic problems with the CETA allocation process, as it affects small cities, is that local officials often have only a vague idea of how it works. The variety of prime sponsor arrangements under CETA often contributes to the confusion. For example, the mayor of a small city served by a single-county prime sponsor may have difficulty discussing local CETA programs with

the mayor of a small city in the next county which is served by a BOS prime sponsor. While both mayors may have the same questions to ask about how a city obtains a subgrant or how the program planning process works, the answers to their questions may be quite different because of the nature of the different prime sponsor arrangements and the differences in the planning processes.

Having basic information about how CETA funds are allocated is of paramount importance to small city officials. In one of the small cities visited, local officials were completely unaware of the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP) Program. The prime sponsor had never provided the city with information about the YCCIP Program and had never solicited projects from the city during the 2-year history of the program. While this is an extreme case, it exemplified the information barriers faced by small cities in the CETA allocation process.

This information problem is further exacerbated by the categorization of CETA programs. Prime sponsors receive program funds under CETA through Titles IIB, IIC, IID, IV-YETP, IV-YCCIP, IV-SYEP, VI, and VII. Each of these fund allocations is associated with a different program purpose and, in many cases, with different eligibility criteria and operational guidelines. Prime sponsors are then charged with the responsibility of combining these categorical

programs into some semblance of a sequential, comprehensive service delivery system. In executing its responsibilities, the prime sponsor may have a comprehensive perspective of how these programs relate to each other, but the small city within the prime sponsor's jurisdiction usually does not have this integrated overview. Unless the prime sponsor intends to operate all of these programs through an in-house delivery system, the prime must subgrant for the delivery of many of these services to local agencies using a request-for-proposal (RFP) process. As a result, the small city sees a variety of RFP's for seemingly unrelated programs and a delivery system that appears to be highly disjointed.

If a small city decides to become a program operator, local officials may be faced with another set of problems associated with the application process. In order to receive funds, CETA prime sponsors must submit an acceptable grant application. In order to meet the federal deadlines for a timely submission, the prime sponsor must set even more stringent time constraints on potential subgrantees if the prime is going to have all required information in time to submit its plan to the Department of Labor (DOL) regional office. In some situations, as was the case in one of the on-site visits, subgrantees of the prime sponsor subgrant to still other local entities. Thus, the subgrantee, in developing its proposal, placed even further time constraints on its planning

process. As a result, small cities often find that they have very little time to plan and develop timely proposals. One local official was notified that Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP) funds were available and that proposals had to be submitted within one week.

Moreover, small cities are frequently placed in the position of having to make their local program plans compatible with prime sponsor plans. Under BOS or large consortia prime sponsor arrangements, this requirement may obfuscate local priorities. One field visit provided an excellent example of how prime sponsor planning goals sometimes create impossible program mandates at the local level. A BOS prime sponsor issued a requirement that 33% of the local program's participants be placed in 4-year accredited colleges upon termination. However, virtually all of the program participants were without high school diplomas or equivalents. While the local program was trying to serve those most in need of service as determined by community standards, the prime sponsor was trying to meet the requirements of a state plan that was completely insensitive to local circumstances or priorities.

Small cities may also, because of the levels of bureaucracy involved, experience difficulties in actually obtaining funds allocated to it once program plans have

been approved. Before it could purchase any services or materials, one small city visited was required first to submit an authorization form for approval; once the authorization form was approved, a purchase order was then required; after approval of the purchase order, the youth program could buy materials, but was required to make the purchase with city funds. Once the purchase was made, the receipt had to be submitted to the prime for reimbursement. These arrangements created a number of operational problems for the city in terms of having materials and equipment in a timely fashion and securing city funds for initial purchases. As a result, there were critical problems in starting programs on time, establishing credit with local businesses, getting rent paid on time, and other cash-flow problems. Because this small city was a subgrantee of another city subgrantee, the fiscal and administrative procedures were so cumbersome that local officials were continually struggling with problems relating to time sheets, reimbursement requests, authorization and purchase forms, and late accounts. Because CETA funds were not coming to the city in a way that could be best utilized at the local level, program staff and youth participants were subjected to enormous inconvenience and operational hardships.

Issues Relating to the Community View of CETA

One of the basic ideas underlying the concept of decentralization is that CETA programs will be designed to reflect the needs and priorities of the community. If the community sees that the CETA programs are addressing their concerns, the programs will enjoy the support of the community and will be more likely to be successful in attaining their objectives. Therefore, it is important that the community view of CETA youth programs be one that is consistent with what the local people feel is a worthwhile investment in their youth.

Because small cities tend not to be directly involved in program operations, initial attitudes of local officials in small cities tend to be molded by what they see of the CETA youth programs and how they are being operated within the community. Small city officials may see a youth clean-up crew or a "leaf raking" project and conclude that CETA is only a make-work program, rather than as a tool for training or career development. Local officials in small cities may have such a narrow view of the potential of CETA programs that CETA is not looked upon as a resource for accomplishing the institutional goals of the city or for developing the employability of the city's youth.

Small cities not operating programs may lack a general understanding of how CETA resources are funnelled into the community, what the goals of the various programs are, who is responsible locally for developing programs, or how to influence local CETA planning or operations. A local official may disapprove of how CETA youth programs are being administered within the community, but may also have little idea how to bring about change.

In some of the most rural areas, community attitudes toward the CETA programs may be quite conservative, and in some cases, may even appear to be at odds with the ultimate goal of CETA programs. One local program official offered an extreme example of this attitude:

> "In our area towns are very small, with only 200-300 people. Most of the people work in agriculture as laborers and are almost totally dependent on (Farmer John) for their livelihood. They not only work in his fields, but if they get into trouble with their rent or their mortgage or the grocery bill, (Farmer John) takes care of them. So what you got is a dependency system. Now, CETA comes along and says that we're going to make these people economically self-sufficient, going to allow them to make their own car payment, pay their own rent, and so on. From a historical point of view, this is a radical idea and it doesn't set too well with the major farmers in the area."

While local program operators in small cities must design programs and provide services to youth that are consistent with community standards

and reflect local priorities, they must also square those standards and priorities with the legislative goals and objectives of the program. At the same time, major planning decisions are often made at the prime sponsor level and may, in many cases, be far removed from the realities of small city community standards. As a result, the small city citizenry, in these cases, may not look upon the programs as worthwhile or productive.

In another area, a similar sentiment was expressed. In this case, the state-administered prime sponsor funded a special agriculture-oriented project in a small city, independent of local youth program operations. The special project was to be administered by a private, non-profit organization that was not locally-based, so the agency had to establish offices in the community in order to operate the program. While the newly-created CBO handled program operations, the parent CBO, which was located over 300 miles away, maintained all fiscal, administrative, and other management information systems. Consequently, the local CETA advisory council and staff never had access to sufficient program information to evaluate the program or even understand the status of its operation. The program was an agricultural cooperative which was intended to teach youth farming skills, as well as farm management skills, with the ultimate goal of the project being that the cooperative

would eventually become an independent venture. While the program was certainly an innovative project and was relevant to the local economy, it did not have the community support and was looked on with suspicion for a variety of reasons: (1) the agency was not locally-based, (2) the agricultural community felt that the project was detracting from its labor force, and (3) local farmers felt that the state was using tax dollars to subsidize an independent farming operation that would compete with their farm products on the market. Therefore, an important ingredient to developing successful youth programs in small cities seems to be generating the support of the local community. Having community support for CETA programs does not necessarily mean that the small city must be the program operator, but it does mean that the program must be consistent with what the community feels is worthwhile in terms of the program objectives and the methods and policies created to achieve those objectives.

Promoting community support within the prime sponsor's jurisdiction may require a delicate approach by the prime's CETA staff. In one field visit the prime's jurisdiction was comprised entirely of small cities, many of which had populations of less than one thousand. Prime sponsor CETA staff reported that they had to actively solicit projects and programs at the local level and that, in many cases, the local officials were only reluctant participants

in programming and in developing contractual relationships. In some cases, the prime sponsor staff had to do most of the work in preparing proposals, designing programs, and nursing the proposal through the prime's planning process. However, if, when the project becomes operational, something goes wrong, local officials resent the prime sponsor for holding the city accountable for something that was, in actuality, developed by the prime sponsor's CETA staff. If the prime sponsor is heavy-handed in this situation, working relationships between the prime and local officials can be destroyed, precluding future efforts at joint planning.

In order to achieve effective decentralization of planning, prime sponsors must be both willing and able to exert more effort toward securing the participation of small city officials in the planning process. To do this, prime sponsors need to be relieved of as much of the administrative encumbrances as possible in planning and implementing CETA programs. Primes cannot be expected to mount a more decentralized planning effort when so much of their staff time must be taken with administrative tasks.

To insure proper negotiation between primes and their small cities in terms of program development and accountability, the CETA planning process must

allow for at least three things: (1) more time for program development at the prime sponsor and subrecipient level, (2) more time and resources for technical assistance and training at the subrecipient level, and (3) less complicated methods for soliciting and developing program proposals.

Issues Related to Management of the Local Economy

In the majority of the on-site visits, local officials complained that many of the small city's youth tend to leave the city once they have achieved independence. While a variety of factors may account for this, local officials most often cited lack of local opportunities as an explanation for this migration. That is, the small city was not seen by these youth as a place that was sufficiently attractive to them in terms of their social and economic future. As a result, small city officials were often concerned about the development of the local economy.

However, the desire to promote economic development may be controversial in some communities. Some small cities fear that economic development will threaten the community identity and change the city's character. As a result, local officials may be completely cold to the idea of economic development or prefer that economic development efforts be undertaken with a controlled, deliberate approach. In one small city, a strong anti-industry atmosphere

was present. Local pressure to attract industry was opposed by an equally strong preference to decrease municipal services with the declining tax base. As a result, the city established an Industrial Redevelopment Agency but provided it with no budget.

Other small city officials are quicker to embrace a bold approach to developing the local economy and expanding the tax base. In these cases, local officials generally express a desire to foster the viability of the community, but do not feel that they always have access to all the resources to manage the local economy.

The strategies most frequently cited by local officials to promote economic development include the following:

1. To bolster and stabilize existing small businesses within the community;

2. To attract new industry and private business establishments to the area; and

3. To be able to prevent existing industry and business from closing or re-locating and to be able to reduce the sudden adverse social and economic impact of a plant or business closing or re-location on the community through advance planning.

The tools available under CETA that could be used to address these concerns are: (1) Title VII program activities, (2) the on-the-job

training (OJT) component, and (3) the Targeted Job Tax Credit (TJTC) program. With a few notable exceptions, Title VII was virtually unheard of by local program operators in the small cities visited. While TJTC seemed to be equally obscure, local program operators and private employers often claim that the TJTC program does not provide appropriate incentives for the small city business establishments. The local non-agricultural labor market in small and rural cities tends to be dominated by the very small employer, which is usually a retail establishment or a service industry. Moreover, many local businesses may be family-oriented.

As a result, the decision to hire by the small employer may not be an entirely economic decision; the small employer may place a greater weight on how the decision will affect the morale and work habits of the other employees, especially in family-oriented businesses. Consequently, the small employer does not always respond to a financial incentive to hire unless it is perceived to outweigh these other considerations. Using the OJT program as an enticement for private business suffers from this same weakness, as well as two additional problems. First, local program operators frequently complain that small businesses usually have cashflow problems and may experience financial difficulties on a payroll-to-payroll basis. Consequently, the reimbursement methods used under OJT contracts may not provide the monetary incentive necessary to

induce the small employer to hire and train an economically disadvantaged youth. The OJT reimbursement problem is often compounded under small program operations because the city is a subgrantee and must contend with more layers of bureaucracy in obtaining OJT payments for local employers, with reimbursements taking anywhere from two weeks to three months. Second, OJT contracts are geared toward providing training within the constraints of a single occupational skill, which generally does not suit the needs of a small city private employer. A small employer may need a machine operator; but, in a small city setting, the machine operator may also be expected to do welding, building maintenance, equipment repair, inventory control, and a variety of other tasks in the workplace. Consequently, it is difficult to develop an OJT contract for a "jack of all trades."

Economic development strategies in small cities are further complicated by the attitudes of private employers in the small city setting. Local program operators in small cities often have difficulty "selling" CETA to private business establishments in the local economy. Small businesses are inclined to identify CETA programs with paperwork and federal bureaucracy. The kind of small businesses in small cities often view the federal government as a giant monolithic structure; and they fear that if they touch any part of it, the

entire structure will topple down on them, and they will be overwhelmed by IRS audits, OSHA reviews, and other forms of federal investigations. In addition, local program operators sometimes have difficulty getting information about the TJTC program from local offices of the state employment service or from prime sponsors. As a result, local youth program operators may have difficulty developing an incentive "package" that is attractive to the small city private sector.

For small cities in the most rural economies, an even more formidable barrier to economic development is faced. As one local official stated: "How can you even begin to approach private industry when you know that the human resources are not available locally? Industries are not going to come here unless they know that the local people can do their work." Economic development strategies in small cities can not overlook the supply side of the equation. Job creation efforts to promote the demand for labor will not be effective if the local labor force does not have the skills necessary to fill those jobs. The above quotation is particularly interesting in this regard because the local CETA program operator initially began as an economic development agency in 1972; but by 1977, the agency had shifted the main thrust of its effort to providing human services, recognizing that it must develop the supply of labor with the same intensity that it promotes the demand for labor.

Therefore, because of the sometimes controversial nature of economic development in small cities, local officials tend to feel that they must have a firm command of economic development resources. Small city local officials are concerned with their youth populations and want to be able to manage their local economies to improve local opportunities and to promote growth without damaging the character of the small city or the community identity.

## Conclusions and Policy Implications

### Implications for the Local Delivery System

In terms of providing comprehensive services to youth, the major programming problems confronting CETA youth programs in small cities seem to be related to: (1) lack of occupational choice in work and training sites; (2) limitations in utilizing vocational training resources; (3) lack of transportation; (4) a general inability of CETA private sector programs to meet the needs of small private employers; (5) lack of suitable employment opportunities in small city labor markets; and (6) a general tendency for the CETA delivery system serving small cities to be fragmented, primarily due to the way youth and other CETA funds tend to be funnelled to the local level.

These major problem areas combine to impact small city CETA youth programs in a number of adverse ways:

1. Matching CETA-eligible youth with suitable work or training opportunities is hampered, and the ability of local program operators to use CETA as a tool for career development is limited beyond a fairly narrow scope of occupations;

2. In order to satisfy enrollment and expenditure requirements, local program operators find that decisions relating to program design and participant selection are too often dictated by factors other than the needs of the youth; whether or not the youth has transportation, whether or not the youth aspires to an occupation for which there is an available work site or vocational program, and whether or not the youth's participation

coincides with vocational training schedules may play just as big a role in enrollment decisions as the youth's individual needs for service; local program operators are left by local circumstances with the responsibility of forcing a "square peg into a round hole" when it comes to program design;

3. Local program operators in small cities sometimes find that efforts to meet the individual needs of youth are more costly in terms of both time and money, due primarily to the added expense of providing training, transportation, and supportive services; consequently, cost per participant, cost per placement, and other performance indicators may be higher;

4. The need to provide certain kinds and levels of occupational training and job skills is often tempered by the limited availability of employment and training opportunities in the local labor market; consequently, EDP goals and objectives may not be accomplished within the participation time limits required by federal regulations;

5. Local officials and program operators at the subgrantee level, in many cases, lack a clear understanding of program goals and objectives; the increasing complexity and categorization of CETA programs, the way in which CETA funds are funnelled into small cities, and the problems of general information dissemination combine to obstruct and confuse the understanding of CETA program goals in small cities; and

6. Local program operators have difficulty designing youth programs that offer comprehensive services because of the fragmented nature of the CETA delivery system in small and rural cities; moreover, linkage of CETA youth programs with other CETA programs, especially under Title VII, and with other federal programs, especially economic development programs, is underly complicated. There may be a wide variety of local entities operating various CETA programs, with only minimal linkages among the deliverers of service. Consequently, programming sequential services or activities requires monumental coordination.

These kinds of problems suggest some specific policies for Department of Labor consideration. Basically, local officials prefer to solve their own problems

without interference from the federal government. Rather, small cities seem to look to the federal government to create a policy environment within which local officials can address their problems with the greatest amount of flexibility and to provide guidance when needed. In this context, the Department of Labor might assume an administrative posture that includes the following variables:

1. Investing a greater portion of DOL discretionary money in capacity building efforts at all levels of the CETA system, but especially at the prime sponsor and subgrantee level. At a very minimum, these efforts should include making information about resources available and insuring that local officials' access to these resources is unencumbered. Local officials and program operators at the subrecipient level need a comprehensive understanding of all CETA programs, of the CETA planning process, and of resources that are related to community and economic development.

2. Reducing the administrative burdens and bureaucratic red tape associated with grant application and administration, especially subgrant management. Consolidation of youth programs and even reversion to a single block grant approach to CETA allocations would eliminate much of the fragmentation characteristic of small city delivery systems. Tempering the mandate for prime sponsors to give preference to community-based organizations would also contribute to a more appropriate focus for delivery systems in small cities.

3. Promoting a greater decentralization of program planning and decision-making. While all small cities do not necessarily have an overwhelming desire to operate CETA programs directly, they do have a desire to have a say in local CETA policy creation and to give direction to program development. CETA regulations should be more specific in allowing locally-elected officials, other than the prime sponsor, representation on all CETA

advisory councils. Program agent status should be lowered to 25,000 population to insure that small cities at least have the opportunity to direct the application of CETA resources in their communities. Policies regarding exceptional circumstance prime sponsorship should be reconsidered to permit and encourage small units of local government to form prime sponsor consortia agreements, irrespective of population requirements. Regulations and policy directives should encourage regionalized planning in state-administered CETA programs, perhaps coinciding with the planning districts of economic development districts or other regional planning jurisdictions.

4. Reconsidering how private sector oriented resources are applied to small city labor markets. Because of the special nature of private sector business establishments in small cities, local CETA program operators need more flexibility in designing CETA incentives for small businesses. Allowing limited work experience in the private sector and liberalizing the OJT reimbursement schedule would not only promote greater participation of small city private employers but would also open up a wider range of occupational choices to small city CETA programs. Also, CETA-funded projects to rehabilitate or refurbish property owned by private-for-profit businesses should be permitted where the project is part of a comprehensive community and economic development plan supported by small city municipal government.

5. Reconsidering the focus of CETA youth programs in small and rural communities. CETA programs in small cities should place less emphasis on the narrow objectives of occupational and skill training with the ultimate goal of placing youth in permanent employment. Rather, CETA resources should focus on accomplishing objectives that are more compatible with local circumstances and what the small city perceives as the most worthwhile objectives: Expanding the local opportunities for occupational choice and vocational exploration, using CETA resources to promote the viability of the local economy, and providing services to the community that can not be supported by the city's tax base.

Implications for the Small City

For a variety of reasons, small city officials are very much concerned about their ability to manage their local labor markets. Local elected officials

in small cities seem to be especially concerned with creating the kinds of social and economic opportunities in their small cities which will encourage the cities' youth population to remain at home. All too often, small city youth leave the city to seek opportunity elsewhere. However, in order to create local opportunities for small city youth, elected officials need to be able to command an array of resources that contribute to a comprehensive economic development strategy.

Consequently, small city officials need to be in a position to understand what resources are available under economic development programs as well as through CETA legislation, especially for youth under Title IV and for private sector activities under Title VII. They also need to understand how these resources can be secured, what opportunities there are for local officials to participate in the development of local CETA policies, and how CETA planning processes work under various prime sponsor arrangements.

One of the major concepts of the CETA legislation is the idea of decentralization, which holds that local officials are in the best position to identify local employment problems, to propose viable solutions to those problems, and to plan and implement programs designed to alleviate those problems. Decentralized employment and training programs are intended to provide local officials with

the resources and the flexibility to implement remedies at the local level that will target services to those most in need, that will eliminate duplication of effort, that will provide a comprehensive approach to service delivery, and that will maximize the utilization of resources available at the local level.

However, for small cities, the concept of decentralization is not being realized. Local officials in small cities are not participating in the decision-making process to determine what CETA services are to be provided to the youth in their cities, what target groups are identified for service, how programs are designed, what program operators are funded, or what policies are developed.

Moreover, CETA youth resources are not being directed to small cities in a way that is the most effective and the most useful. Small cities are served under a wide variety of prime sponsor arrangements. Prime sponsors, in turn, may subgrant with a broad range of local entities for youth program operations. As a result, small city officials may find it difficult to determine what CETA resources are available, who has ultimate authority for their distribution, what rules and regulations govern their use, what types of employment and training activities can be funded, or how to go about obtaining CETA youth grants.

The fact that small cities are served by such a wide variety of political and administrative arrangements has significant implications in terms of the small city's ability to influence local CETA policies that may affect the city's youth, the city's labor market, or the city itself. How the prime sponsor is organized, the administrative structure created by the prime to implement the programs, and the structure and function of the CETA advisory council are critical to the small city's ability to gain information about what CETA resources are available locally, to obtain information about the regulations and guidelines that govern how CETA resources can be used, to participate in the development of CETA policies that impact on the city, and to apply for and receive CETA subgrants.

Small cities do not have direct contact with regional offices of the Department of Labor or with federal representatives. Therefore, there may be considerable obstacles for small cities in obtaining accurate and timely information about federal or regional CETA policies and guidelines. Moreover, small cities are not faced with uniform circumstances for making their concerns known to CETA prime sponsors. For example, the ability of a small city to influence local CETA policies created by a single-county prime sponsor may be far different from its ability to influence policies created by a state-administered CETA program. There is a significant difference between a city-

county and a city-state relationship in terms of physical proximity and in terms of accessibility to the decision-making process. Moreover, the type of administrative procedures available to a small city and the sensitivity of the prime sponsor to the city's needs may vary greatly among the different prime sponsor arrangements, making it more difficult for small cities to "compare notes" on the technicalities of CETA and on mechanisms for influencing local policies. Small cities also find that the small city-prime sponsor relationship does not exist in a vacuum. Small cities in a number of cases have entered into agreements with their county governments for joint services. For example, a county and a small city may join forces to provide health services, police or fire protection, or other public services. Consequently, small city officials may be apprehensive about complaining about their role or participation in CETA programs for fear of jeopardizing these other political and financial arrangements. In addition, models developed by a small city under one prime sponsor arrangement may have little transferability to a small city under a different prime sponsor arrangement.

What type of delivery system is created at the local level is determined by the local administrative processes utilized in addressing three basic issues: (1) what categories of youth are most in need of service, (2) what services

are most appropriate for those youth, and (3) what local agencies are best suited to provide those services. The ultimate responsibility for deciding these issues rests with the prime sponsor. Therefore, small cities have, basically, only two formal ways of influencing these decisions: through the prime's formal grievance procedures and through the prime's advisory council and planning processes. Grievance procedures are probably the least effective method of participating in policy development for a variety of reasons: they are time-consuming and administratively cumbersome; they usually create ill-will between the parties; they must be issue-oriented; and they provide recourse only after a policy decision has been made, rather than before a course of action is decided. On the other hand, participation in the local advisory and planning processes provides small cities with an on-going method of participation in local CETA affairs and allows small cities to address a broad range of local employment issues as a constructive partner in the planning process. And, most importantly it is more likely to be compatible with existing small city-prime sponsor relationships.

One of the implicit assumptions of the CETA prime sponsor system is that cities with populations of less than 100,000 will not have the administrative capability to plan, implement, and evaluate programs effectively. Consequently, this

population requirement excludes small cities from direct participation in the planning and decision-making process of programs that have an important impact on small city labor markets and economic well-being. Small city officials who are concerned with the management of their local labor markets find themselves faced with a unique set of local economic conditions. As a result, small city officials need to be able to command a wide range of local, state, and federal resources to address the problems associated with managing the local economy. The ability of a small city to create the social and economic opportunities necessary to prevent its youth from migrating and to promote viable economic development activities depends largely on the ability of small city officials to influence the application of these resources to community needs.

If small cities are going to have the opportunity to participate in managing their local labor markets and in planning how CETA resources can best be used in serving the small cities' youth, then the following recommendations must be considered:

1. Small cities should be provided with technical information about the administrative structure of CETA, about what mechanisms are available under the various prime sponsor arrangements for influencing the development of local CETA policies, and about how they can become more actively involved in local CETA operations affecting their cities' youth and the economic future of the small cities themselves;

2. Because economic development is such a sensitive issue in small and rural cities, the planning and implementation of economic development activities should be locally-based; small city officials should be permitted more direct access to federal resources that bear on local economic development, such as CETA, Section 18 Transportation, HCDA, vocational education, Small Business Administration, and Farm Home Administration resources.

3. Systemmatic efforts should be undertaken to promote capacity building at the local level for planning of community and economic development. In small and rural cities, creation of employment and training opportunities must take place in the larger context of economic development, and CETA programs should be one component of this effort. CETA resources alone can not be expected to provide small city youth with adequate employment and training opportunities. Small city officials need to enhance their capacity to analyze and predict future trends or events in their local economies, to plan in advance of these events, and to plan how federal resources are used within their communities.

4. Department of Labor administrative and regulatory policies should be reviewed to relieve prime sponsors of as many of the restrictive and cumbersome administrative and reporting requirements as possible to allow primes more time and energy for program development and planning. Every effort should be made to promote community planning, for both CETA and economic development. Locally-based planning is essential in developing community support for CETA programs in small and rural cities.

5. Consolidation of youth programs under a single basic grant would contribute to the elimination of the fragmentation in the youth delivery system in small cities and would promote a more comprehensive perspective to service delivery. Local officials in small cities need to have a clear understanding of program goals and need to be able to take a view of CETA resources that is broader than that promoted by the increasingly categorical nature of CETA. Separate allocation formulas for each CETA program or Title only increase the fragmentation of services and confuses the ultimate goals and objectives of CETA.

Small and rural cities can make a valuable contribution to prime sponsors, both in the planning process and in the implementation of programs. Local officials in small cities can provide primes with a community-based focus for program activities in developing appropriate programs for small city youth. Small cities can provide prime sponsors with critical information about the day-to-day function of their programs, which could be helpful in program monitoring and evaluation. Local officials could be instrumental in securing the participation of local small businesses in their communities; and small cities can assist primes in promoting community-based economic development activities. And, for those small cities which desire, they can serve as local program operators.

However, the role of small cities in making these contributions depends on the availability of opportunities to become actively involved in local CETA operations. One of the basic ingredients in creating these opportunities is information. Yet, CETA information dissemination systems do not seem to recognize small cities at the subrecipient level. As a result, small cities, to the extent that they get information about CETA, must rely on their prime sponsors, which may have only limited capacity to provide comprehensive educational assistance to communities within their jurisdictions, to undertake systemmatic efforts to include small cities in CETA planning processes, or to develop an active public planning process at the community level. One of the fundamental conclusions of this report is that the delivery of services to youth in small and rural cities can be significantly improved by promoting the participation of local government in the CETA planning process.

# APPENDIX A

## Mail Survey of Small Cities: Methodology and Survey Tables

## MAIL SURVEY OF SMALL CITIES METHODOLOGY AND SURVEY TABLES

In August of 1979, a mail questionnaire was sent to approximately 536 NLC membership cities with populations of 75,000 or less. The primary purpose of the mail questionnaire was to establish a data base for identifying problems that are unique to smaller cities and rural communities in planning and implementing CETA youth programs and to determine the role that small cities play in CETA youth program operations at the local level. Of the 536 questionnaires, 300 were returned, for a response rate of 56%. Of these 300, approximately 79% (236) were completed by cities which did not have contractural responsibility for the complete planning and implementing of CETA youth programs, although these cities did serve as work or training sites in most cases. The remaining 64 (21%) questionnaires were completed by cities which were subgrantees of local or state CETA prime sponsors for the operation of part or all of the local CETA youth programs. Subgrantee cities, in most cases, are those cities that receive administrative funds for operating youth programs and have contractual obligations for the expenditure of funds and the provision of services, as well as for meeting specific performance goals.

Survey data were supplemented by a series of on-site visits to selected small cities. In this way, more detailed information was collected, providing insight into the nature of the problems revealed by the questionnaire. In other cases, survey data were bolstered by telephone contact or by correspondence to clarify survey responses or to gather additional information about problem areas.

### Description of the Sample

Perhaps the most serious concern for developing a valid data base from the survey is associated with non-sampling bias. Non-sampling bias is introduced into a survey when the units to be analyzed (e.g., small cities) are selected in a non-random fashion. Since the small cities selected for this survey sample are comprised exclusively from NLC member cities, the elimination of non-sampling bias is a critical factor.

One way to minimize non-sampling bias is to increase the sample size. As the sample size becomes larger and larger, the statistical pitfalls of using non-random methods for selecting the sample are diminished; and non-sampling bias is completely eliminated if the sample is 100% of the universe to be analyzed. Moreover, a high response rate further insures reliability of the generalizations derived from the data base.

According to the 1970 Census, there are 8,700 incorporated areas in the United States with populations of 100,000 or less. Of these 8,700 incorporated areas, 92% (8,013) have populations of less than 25,000. Consequently, if all cities with populations of 75,000 or less are included in this survey analysis, the NLC sample of 536 small cities represents only about 6% of the total universe (i.e., 8,700) and, as a result, non-sampling bias becomes a significant problem. However, by focusing on cities with populations between 25,000 and 75,000, the NLC survey includes 536 of the 736 small cities in this population range, for a 73% sample, and non-sample bias is effectively minimized.

TABLES A and B provide, respectively, a state and regional comparision of the total small cities to both the number of small cities in the NLC sample and the number of sample cities which responded to the survey questionnaire. Column 3 of TABLE B indicates the ratio of NLC small cities to total U.S. small cities for each of the ten U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) regions. The closer this percentage approximates 100%, the more effectively non-sample bias is eliminated. Column 5 of TABLE B shows the response rate for each of the ten regions, as well as the overall response rate of 56% for the complete survey. Column 6 of TABLE B compares the responses received from the small cities in each region with the total number small cities in that region, which indicates the percentage of the universe captured by the NLC sample. Therefore, with a 73% sample and a 56% response rate, the NLC sample, in effect, represents 41% of all cities in this population range.

Another point of concern relates to the geographic dispersion of the small cities in the NLC sample. If some regions of the country are over-represented in the NLC sample of small cities, then the unique characteristics of a particular region could introduce a bias into the aggregate survey results. TABLE C provides a regional comparison of three sets of data: (1) total U.S. small cities, (2) NLC sample cities, and (3) NLC sample cities which responded to the questionnaire. Columns 2, 4, and 6 of this table show the regional distribution of small cities for each one of these three sets of data. Geographic bias is introduced into the sample if there is a significant disparity among these three percentages for each region. TABLE D provides a comparison to determine the extent to which geographic bias enters the survey sample.

In TABLE D, Column 1 shows the regional distribution of all U.S. small cities; Column 2 is the regional distribution of all small cities in the NLC sample; Column 5 is the regional distribution of NLC small cities which responded to the survey questionnaire; Column 3 shows the aggregate difference between Columns 1 and 2, and suggests the presence of a geographic bias;

and Column 4 states whether such a bias is implied for the NLC sample in each of the ten Regions. Similarly, Column 6 represents the aggregate difference between Columns 1 and 5, which suggests the presence of a regional bias in the responses of the NLC cities; and Column 7 states the degree to which such a bias occurs in each of the Regions. As can be seen from TABLE D, the only Region for which there may be some concern for Regional bias is DOL Region I, which shows an over-representation. However, since the small cities in Region I represent only about 11% of all small cities, and because the degree of bias is so small, the effect of the bias on the total sample is probably minimal.

Description of the Survey Instrument

The instrument used in the survey is divided into three sections. Section A provides for basic identifying information and is completed by all city respondents. For those small cities which subgrant with their prime sponsors for CETA funds to plan and operate youth programs, only Section B is completed; all other cities skip Section B and complete Section C. Cities completing Section B are referred to as "Subgrantee" cities, while those completing Section C are referred to as "Non-Subgrantee" cities.

Since the survey includes only those cities with populations of 75,000 or less, none of the cities involved are CETA prime sponsors. Therefore, in order to plan and operate a CETA youth program, a survey city must enter into a subgrant or other contractual arrangement to receive CETA youth funds from a CETA Prime Sponsor. These are the cities that complete Section B of the questionnaire.

Other cities, while they may not be subgrantees of a CETA prime sponsor, may participate in some way in program planning or operations. Most commonly, non-subgrantee small cities participate in CETA youth program operations by acting as work site agencies. Consequently, the only CETA funds these cities receive, in all likelihood, are for the reimbursement of wages, and perhaps in some cases, equipment necessary for the completion of youth projects.

In answering the questionnaire, respondents were asked, in most cases, to indicate the severity of a particular problem by circling a number 1 through 5, with "1" corresponding to "not a problem" and "5" indicating a "severe problem." For purposes of analysis, these five possible answers were categorized in the following manner. If a city circled "1", the issue was characterized as "not a problem." If "2" or "3" was circled, the problem was characterized as a "moderate problem"; and if "4" or "5" was circled, the issue was considered to be a "major problem."

Section B of the questionnaire (for subgrantee cities) is more detailed in the information it requests, based on the expectation that subgrantee cities would have a better knowledge of CETA youth program operations. Section C (for non-subgrantee cities) asks for similar information, but is more limited in scope, since it can be assumed that cities which are not involved in program planning or operations either will not have direct knowledge of the subject matter or the question will not have any applicability.

Questions to be included in the survey were selected using several different criteria. First, a review of the literature suggested a number of problems areas that might be associated with planning and implementing CETA youth programs in small cities and rural communities. However, in addition to identifying CETA operational problems and barriers to employment faced by youth in small cities, survey questions were designed to provide information about how services are delivered, what types of agencies are selected to deliver services, and what CETA services are provided to youth in small cities. Moreover, questions were included that would provide data relating to the planning and policy-making process as well as the delivery system. Finally, the survey incorporated questions that would define the role of the small city in both the planning and operating of CETA youth programs and that would identify the major concerns of small cities in local program operations.

Because of the large number of questions asked, a major concern in designing the survey was survey response. Since lengthly and detailed questionnaires tend to reduce response rate, the questionnaire was designed so that the respondents could address a large number of questions without having to spend a great deal of time or do a great deal of writing. Consequently, most of the questions were designed so that they could be answered by checking or circling a response. As a result, much of the data from the survey can be used to determine what issues are problems and how severe a problem it is; but the data, in most cases, do not explain why the issue is a problem. Only a limited number of questions were included that provided this kind of explanatory information. For this reason, survey data have been supplementd by numerous on-site visits, as well as telephone inquiries and correspondence.

It should be pointed out that some of the questions in the survey could not be used in the final analysis because of high non-response rate. These questions, contained in Section B of the survey, were questions relating to funding and service levels, program activities, target groups, and linkages. The exact explanation of this high non-response rate to these questions was unclear. In some cases, the city respondents may have preferred not to answer the questions; in other cases, the cities may not have had sufficient information to answer; and in other cases, non-response may have resulted from the way the question was structured in the survey.

A complete analysis of the mail survey results was prepared in a separate report to the Department of Labor, entitled "Small City Survey: The Operation of CETA Youth Programs in Small Cities."

## Methodology

### Index of Tables

| TABLE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|
| TABLE A | Comparison by State of Survey Responses to Total NLC Cities Surveyed and to Total U.S. Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000 |
| TABLE B | Comparison by Region of Survey Responses to Total NLC Cities Surveyed and to Total U.S. Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000 |
| TABLE C | Comparison by Region of Total U.S. Cities, Total NLC Cities Surveyed, and Total Responses Received for Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000 |
| TABLE D | Comparison by Region of Differences Between the Percentages of NLC Cities Surveyed and of Responses Received for Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 80,000 to the Percentage of Total Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000 |

TABLE A

Comparison by State of Survey Responses to Total NLC Cities Surveyed and to Total U.S. Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000

| State and Region | Total U.S. Cities* | NLC Cities Surveyed | NLC Cities Surveyed as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities | Responses Received | Survey Response Rate | Responses as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Region I | 57 | 63 | 110%** | 34 | 54% | 60% |
| Connecticut | 12 | 20 | 166%** | 10 | 50% | 84% |
| Rhode Island | 6 | 5 | 83% | 3 | 60% | 50% |
| Maine | 3 | 3 | 100% | 2 | 67% | 67% |
| Massachusetts | 31 | 32 | 103%** | 17 | 54% | 55% |
| Vermont | 1 | 1 | 100% | 1 | 100% | 100% |
| New Hampshire | 4 | 2 | 50% | 1 | 50% | 25% |
| Region II | 82 | 61 | 74% | 30 | 49% | 37% |
| New York | 47 | 19 | 38% | 8 | 45% | 17% |
| New Jersey | 35 | 43 | 123%** | 22 | 51% | 81% |
| Region III | 60 | 31 | 51% | 21 | 68% | 35% |
| Delaware | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Maryland | 20 | 5 | 25% | 3 | 60% | 15% |
| Pennsylvania | 23 | 16 | 70% | 11 | 69% | 48% |
| Virginia | 9 | 5 | 56% | 4 | 80% | 45% |
| West Virginia | 7 | 5 | 71% | 3 | 60% | 43% |

(continued)

TABLE A (continued)

Comparison by State of Survey Responses to Total NLC Cities Surveyed and to Total U.S. Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000

| State and Region | Total U.S. Cities* | NLC Cities Surveyed | NLC Cities Surveyed as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities | Responses Received | Survey Response Rate | Responses as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Region IV | 86 | 68 | 79% | 38 | 56% | 44% |
| North Carolina | 15 | 10 | 67% | 6 | 60% | 40% |
| South Carolina | 6 | 6 | 100% | 6 | 100% | 100% |
| Tennessee | 6 | 4 | 67% | 3 | 75 | 50% |
| Mississippi | 8 | 5 | 63% | 2 | 40% | 25% |
| Alabama | 10 | 8 | 80% | 3 | 38% | 30% |
| Kentucky | 8 | 5 | 63% | 2 | 40% | 25% |
| Florida | 24 | 22 | 92% | 12 | 55% | 51% |
| Georgia | 9 | 8 | 89% | 4 | 50% | 44% |
| Region V | 186 | 142 | 76% | 79 | 56% | 43% |
| Wisconsin | 20 | 15 | 75% | 7 | 47% | 35% |
| Illinois | 55 | 45 | 82% | 25 | 56% | 46% |
| Indiana | 14 | 12 | 86% | 8 | 67% | 57% |
| Michigan | 37 | 27 | 73% | 15 | 56% | 41% |
| Ohio | 41 | 30 | 73% | 15 | 50% | 37% |
| Minnesota | 19 | 13 | 68% | 9 | 69% | 47% |

(continued)

TABLE A (continued)

Comparison by State of Survey Responses to Total NLC Cities Surveyed and to Total U.S. Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000

| State and Region | Total U.S. Cities* | NLC Cities Surveyed | NLC Cities Surveyed as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities | Responses Received | Survey Response Rate | Responses as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Region VI | 67 | 42 | 63% | 20 | 48% | 30% |
| Arkansas | 8 | 5 | 63% | 4 | 80% | 50% |
| New Mexico | 6 | 3 | 50% | 3 | 100% | 50% |
| Oklahoma | 10 | 5 | 50% | 3 | 60% | 30% |
| Louisiana | 8 | 8 | 100% | 3 | 38% | 38% |
| Texas | 35 | 21 | 50% | 7 | 33% | 20% |
| Region VII | 34 | 23 | 68% | 12 | 52% | 35% |
| Missouri | 12 | 9 | 75% | 4 | 44% | 33% |
| Iowa | 14 | 10 | 71% | 8 | 80% | 57% |
| Kansas | 7 | 3 | 43% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Nebraska | 1 | 1 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Region VIII | 28 | 19 | 68% | 13 | 68% | 46% |
| Colorado | 11 | 7 | 64% | 3 | 43% | 27% |
| Montana | 3 | 2 | 67% | 2 | 100% | 67% |
| North Dakota | 4 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 50% | 50% |
| South Dakota | 3 | 2 | 67% | 2 | 100% | 67% |
| Utah | 5 | 2 | 40% | 2 | 100% | 40% |
| Wyoming | 2 | 2 | 100% | 2 | 100% | 100% |

(continued)

TABLE A (continued)

Comparison by State of Survey Responses to Total NLC Cities Surveyed and to Total U.S. Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000

| State and Region | Total U.S. Cities* | NLC Cities Surveyed | NLC Cities Surveyed as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities | Responses Received | Survey Response Rate | Responses as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Region IX | 117 | 77 | 66% | 48 | 62% | 41% |
| California | 106 | 74 | 70% | 47 | 64% | 44% |
| Arizona | 6 | 2 | 33% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Nevada | 2 | 1 | 50% | 1 | 100% | 50% |
| Hawaii | 3 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Region X | 19 | 10 | 53% | 5 | 50% | 26% |
| Idaho | 4 | 2 | 50% | 1 | 50% | 25% |
| Washington | 9 | 7 | 78% | 4 | 57% | 44% |
| Oregon | 5 | 1 | 20% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Alaska | 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| TOTAL | 736 | 536 | 73% | 300 | 56% | 41% |

* From 1970 Census Characteristics of the Population Table 5, "Population of Incorporated and Unincorporated Places" for each state.

**Probably results from an aberration in the 1970 Census or from an increase in the number of cities since 1970.

**TABLE B**

**Comparison by Region of Survey Responses to Total NLC Cities Surveyed and to Total U.S. Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000**

| All Regions | Total U.S. Cities* | NLC Cities Surveyed | NLC Cities Surveyed as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities | Responses Received | Survey Response Rate | Responses as a Percentage of Total U.S. Cities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| I | 57 | 63 | 110%** | 34 | 54% | 60% |
| II | 82 | 61 | 74% | 30 | 49% | 37% |
| III | 60 | 31 | 51% | 21 | 68% | 35% |
| IV | 86 | 68 | 79% | 38 | 56% | 44% |
| V | 186 | 142 | 76% | 79 | 56% | 43% |
| VI | 67 | 42 | 63% | 20 | 48% | 30% |
| VII | 34 | 23 | 68% | 12 | 52% | 35% |
| VIII | 28 | 19 | 68% | 13 | 68% | 46% |
| IX | 117 | 77 | 66% | 48 | 62% | 41% |
| X | 19 | 10 | 53% | 5 | 50% | 26% |
| TOTAL | 736 | 536 | 73% | 300 | 56% | 41% |

*From 1970 Census Characteristics of the Population Table 5, "Population of Incorporated and Unincorporated Places" for each state.

**Probably results from an aberration in the 1970 Census or from an increase in the number of cities since 1970.

TABLE C

Comparison by Region of Total U.S. Cities, Total NLC Cities Surveyed, and Total Responses Received for Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000

| REGION | Total U.S. Cities | | NLC Sample | | Sample Responses | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number (1) | Percent (2) | Number (3) | Percent (4) | Number (5) | Percent (6) |
| I | 57 | 7.7% | 63 | 11.7% | 34 | 11.3% |
| II | 82 | 11.1% | 61 | 11.4% | 30 | 10.0% |
| III | 60 | 8.2% | 31 | 5.8% | 21 | 7.0% |
| IV | 86 | 11.7% | 68 | 12.7% | 38 | 12.7% |
| V | 186 | 25.3% | 142 | 26.5% | 79 | 26.3% |
| VI | 67 | 9.1% | 42 | 7.8% | 20 | 6.7% |
| VII | 34 | 4.6% | 23 | 4.3% | 12 | 4.0% |
| VIII | 28 | 3.8% | 19 | 3.5% | 13 | 4.3% |
| IX | 117 | 15.9% | 77 | 14.4% | 48 | 16.0% |
| X | 19 | 2.6% | 10 | 1.9% | 5 | 1.7% |
| TOTAL | 736 | 100.0% | 536 | 100.0% | 300 | 100.0% |

*From 1970 Census, Characteristics of the Population, Table 5, "Population of Incorporated and Unincorporated Places", for each state, aggregated by region.

TABLE D

Comparison by Region of Differences between the Percentages of NLC Cities Surveyed and of Responses Received for Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 80,000 to the Percentage of Total Cities with Populations of 25,000 to 100,000

| Region | Cities in Region as a Percentage of Total Cities (1) | NLC Cities Surveyed in Region as a Percentage of Total NLC Cities (2) | Difference Between Region as a Percentage of Total Cities (3) | Sampling Status (Over/Under) (4) | Responses in Region as a Percentage of Total Responses (5) | Difference Between Percentages of Responses and Total Cities (6) | Representation Status (Over/Under) (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | 7.7% | 11.7% | +4.0 | Over | 11.3% | +3.6 | Over |
| II | 11.1% | 11.4% | +0.3 | Okay | 10.0% | -1.1 | Okay |
| III | 8.2% | 5.8% | -2.4 | Slightly Under | 7.0% | -1.3 | Okay |
| IV | 11.7% | 12.7% | +1.0 | Okay | 12.7% | +1.0 | Okay |
| V | 25.3% | 26.5% | +1.2 | Okay | 26.3% | +1.0 | Okay |
| VI | 9.1% | 7.8% | -1.3 | Okay | 6.7% | -2.4 | Slightly Under |
| VII | 4.6% | 4.3% | -0.3 | Okay | 4.0% | -0.6 | Okay |
| VIII | 3.8% | 3.5% | -0.3 | Okay | 4.3% | +0.5 | Okay |
| IX | 15.9% | 14.4% | -1.5 | Okay | 16.0% | +0.1 | Okay |
| X | 2.6% | 1.9% | -0.7 | Okay | 1.7% | -0.8 | Okay |
| TOTAL | 100.0% | 100.0% | — | — | 100.0% | — | — |

## Survey Results

## INDEX OF TABLES


| TABLE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|
| TABLE 1 | Type of Prime Sponsor Serving Small Cities by City Population Size |
| TABLE 2 | Type of Prime Sponsor Serving Small Cities by City Population Size. |
| TABLE 3 | Subgrantee Status of Small Cities by City Population Size. |
| TABLE 4 | Subgrantee Status of Small Cities by City Population Size. |
| TABLE 5 | Type of Prime Sponsor Serving Small Cities by City Subgrantee Status. |
| TABLE 6 | Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by City Population Size. |
| TABLE 7 | Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by Population Size. |
| TABLE 8 | Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by Prime Sponsor Type. |
| TABLE 9 | Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by City's Perception of Problems Created by the Program Operator. |
| TABLE 10 | Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by City's Preference to Operate Its Own Youth Program. |
| TABLE 11 | Type of Youth Programs Operated by Small Cities by City Size. |

## INDEX OF TABLES


| TABLE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|
| TABLE 12 | Type of Youth Programs Operated by Small Cities by Type of Prime Sponsor. |
| TABLE 13 | Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by Prime Sponsor Type. |
| TABLE 14 | Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by the City's Perception of Problems Associated with the Structure or Function of the CETA Youth Advisory Council. |
| TABLE 15 | Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by City Subgrantee Status. |
| TABLE 16 | Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by City Subgrantee Status. |
| TABLE 17 | Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by City Population Size. |
| TABLE 18 | Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by the City's Perception of Problems Created by the Program Operator. |
| TABLE 19 | Problems of Implementing CETA Youth Programs in Small Cities by Severity of Problem. |
| TABLE 20 | Problem Associated with Implementing CETA Youth Programs In Small Cities by Rank Order. |

## INDEX OF TABLES


| TABLE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|
| TABLE 21 | Percentage of Small Cities Indicating Problems with Selected Issues Associated with Implementing CETA Youth Programs by Region. |
| TABLE 22 | Percentage of Small Cities Indicating Major Problems with Selected Issues Associated with Implementing CETA Youth Programs by Region. |

## DEFINITIONS

The following terms are used throughout the survey tables. Below are listed the definitions of these terms to facilitate interpretation of the tables.

### Type of Prime Sponsor

1. Single County Prime -- a prime sponsor that is comprised of only one county, with no other eligible primes within the county jurisdiction; or, a balance-of-county prime sponsor.

2. Local Consortia Prime -- A prime sponsorship comprised of a consortium of local governments, which might include various combinations of cities and counties.

3. State-administered Prime -- a prime sponsor that is either a balance-of-state prime or a state consortia of primes.

### Subgrantee Status

1. Subgrantee City -- a small city that has entered into a contractual relationship with a prime sponsor to deliver CETA youth services. Administrative monies may or may not be included in the subgrant arrangement.

2. Non-Subgrantee City -- a small city that does not have contractual responsibility for youth program operations. However, these cities may act as work sites for youth.

### Type of Program Operator

1. Local Subgrantee -- this term refers to a subgrant arrangement where the prime sponsor subgrants youth program operations to a local government organization other than the small city surveyed. This arrangement is probably most common under state-administered primes and local consortia.

2. Employment Service -- refers to a local office of the state employment service.

TABLE 1

Type of Prime Sponsor Serving Small Cities by City Population Size

| Type of Prime Sponsor | CITY SIZE <50,000 Number | <50,000 Percent | ≥50,000 Number | ≥50,000 Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Single County | 88 | 45% | 50 | 47% | 138 | 46% |
| Local Consortia | 34 | 18% | 27 | 25% | 61 | 20% |
| State-Administered | 72 | 37% | 29 | 28% | 101 | 34% |
| TOTAL | 194 | 100% | 106 | 100% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 2

Type of Prime Sponsor Serving Small Cities by City Population Size

| Type of Prime Sponsor | CITY SIZE <50,000 Number | <50,000 Percent | ≥50,000 Number | ≥50,000 Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Single County | 88 | 64% | 50 | 36% | 138 | 100% |
| Local Consortia | 34 | 56% | 27 | 44% | 61 | 100% |
| State-Administered | 72 | 71% | 29 | 29% | 101 | 100% |
| TOTAL | 194 | 65% | 106 | 35% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 3

Subgrantee Status of Small Cities by City Population Size

| Subgrantee Status | CITY SIZE | | | | TOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | < 50,000 | | ≥ 50,000 | | | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Subgrantee City | 32 | 16% | 32 | 30% | 64 | 21% |
| Non-Subgrantee City | 162 | 84% | 74 | 70% | 236 | 79% |
| TOTAL | 194 | 100% | 106 | 100% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 5

Type of Prime Sponsor Serving Small Cities by City Subgrantee Status

| Type of Prime Sponsor | SUBGRANT STATUS: Subgrantee Number | Subgrantee Percent | Non-Subgrantee Number | Non-Subgrantee Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Single County | 31 | 22% | 107 | 78% | 138 | 100% |
| Local Consortia | 15 | 25% | 46 | 75% | 61 | 100% |
| State-Administered | 18 | 18% | 83 | 82% | 101 | 100% |
| TOTAL | 64 | 21% | 236 | 79% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 4

Subgrantee Status of Small Cities by City Population Size

| Subgrantee Status | CITY SIZE: <50,000 Number | <50,000 Percent | ≥50,000 Number | ≥50,000 Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgrantee City | 32 | 50% | 32 | 50% | 64 | 100% |
| Non-Subgrantee City | 162 | 69% | 74 | 31% | 236 | 100% |
| TOTAL | 194 | 65% | 106 | 35% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 6

Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by City Population Size

| Type of Program Operator | CITY SIZE <50,000 Number | <50,000 Percent | ≥50,000 Number | ≥50,000 Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Small City | 32 | 16% | 32 | 30% | 64 | 21% |
| Prime Sponsor | 71 | 37% | 39 | 37% | 110 | 37% |
| Local Subgrantee | 20 | 10% | 6 | 6% | 26 | 9% |
| Community-Based Organization | 26 | 13% | 10 | 10% | 36 | 12% |
| School District | 10 | 5% | 8 | 8% | 18 | 6% |
| Employment Service | 12 | 6% | 3 | 3% | 15 | 5% |
| Other Agency | 12 | 6% | 3 | 3% | 15 | 5% |
| No Response | 11 | 6% | 5 | 5% | 16 | 5% |
| TOTAL | 194 | 99% | 106 | 102% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 7

Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by City Population Size

| Type of Program Operator | CITY SIZE <50,000 Number | <50,000 Percent | ≥50,000 Number | ≥50,000 Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Small City | 32 | 50% | 32 | 50% | 64 | 100% |
| Prime Sponsor | 71 | 65% | 39 | 35% | 110 | 100% |
| Local Subgrantee | 20 | 77% | 6 | 23% | 26 | 100% |
| Community-Based Organization | 26 | 72% | 10 | 28% | 36 | 100% |
| School District | 10 | 56% | 8 | 44% | 18 | 100% |
| Employment Service | 12 | 80% | 3 | 20% | 15 | 100% |
| Other Agency | 12 | 80% | 3 | 20% | 15 | 100% |
| No Response | 11 | 69% | 5 | 31% | 16 | 100% |
| TOTAL | 194 | 65% | 106 | 35% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 8

Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by Prime Sponsor Type

| Type of Program Operator | PRIME SPONSOR TYPE | | | | | | TOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Single County | | Local Consortium | | State-Administered | | | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Small City | 31 | 22% | 15 | 25% | 18 | 18% | 64 | 21% |
| Prime Sponsor | 74 | 54% | 29 | 48% | 7 | 7% | 110 | 37% |
| Local Subgrantee | 4 | 3% | 3 | 5% | 19 | 19% | 26 | 9% |
| Community-Based Organization | 9 | 7% | 5 | 8% | 22 | 22% | 36 | 12% |
| School District | 9 | 7% | 7 | 11% | 2 | 2% | 18 | 6% |
| Employment Service | 0 | -- | 1 | 2% | 14 | 14% | 15 | 5% |
| Other Agency | 5 | 4% | 1 | 2% | 9 | 9% | 15 | 5% |
| No Response | 6 | 4% | 0 | -- | 10 | 10% | 16 | 5% |
| TOTAL | 138 | 101% | 61 | 101% | 101 | 101% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 9

Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by City's Perception of Problems Created by the Program Operator

| Type of Program Operator | PROBLEMS CREATED FOR CITY BY PROGRAM OPERATOR | | | | | | TOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | | No | | No Response | | | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Prime Sponsor | 17 | 31% | 65 | 51% | 28 | 51% | 110 | 47% |
| Local Subgrantee | 4 | 7% | 19 | 15% | 3 | 5% | 26 | 11% |
| Community-Based Organization | 9 | 17% | 24 | 19% | 3 | 5% | 36 | 15% |
| School District | 12 | 22% | 4 | 3% | 2 | 4% | 18 | 8% |
| Employment Service | 3 | 6% | 10 | 8% | 2 | 4% | 15 | 6% |
| Other Agency | 9 | 17% | 2 | 2% | 4 | 7% | 15 | 6% |
| No Response | 0 | -- | 3 | 2% | 13 | 24% | 16 | 7% |
| TOTAL | 54 | 100% | 127 | 100% | 55 | 100% | 236 | 100% |

TABLE 10

Type of Program Operator Serving Small Cities by City's Preference to Operate Its Own Youth Program

| Type of Program Operator | PREFERENCE FOR CITY-OPERATED PROGRAMS: Yes Number | Yes Percent | No Number | No Percent | No Response Number | No Response Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prime Sponsor | 12 | 33% | 71 | 49% | 27 | 50% | 110 | 47% |
| Local Subgrantee | 4 | 11% | 19 | 13% | 3 | 6% | 26 | 11% |
| Community-Based Organization | 5 | 14% | 28 | 19% | 3 | 6% | 36 | 15% |
| School District | 7 | 19% | 9 | 6% | 2 | 4% | 18 | 8% |
| Employment Service | 3 | 8% | 10 | 7% | 2 | 4% | 15 | 6% |
| Other Agency | 5 | 14% | 6 | 4% | 4 | 7% | 15 | 6% |
| No Response | 0 | -- | 3 | 2% | 13 | 24% | 16 | 7% |
| TOTAL | 36 | 99% | 146 | 100% | 54 | 101% | 236 | 100% |

TABLE 11

Type of Youth Programs Operated by Small Cities by City Size

| Type of Youth Program | CITY SIZE <50,000 Number | <50,000 Percent | ≥50,000 Number | ≥50,000 Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YCCIP | 8 | 25% | 8 | 25% | 16 | 25% |
| YETP | 15 | 47% | 14 | 44% | 29 | 45% |
| SYEP | 26 | 81% | 26 | 81% | 52 | 81% |
| All Three | 6 | 19% | 5 | 16% | 11 | 17% |
| YCCIP Only | 1 | 3% | 2 | 6% | 3 | 5% |
| SYEP Only | 12 | 38% | 15 | 47% | 27 | 42% |
| YETP Only | 2 | 6% | 4 | 13% | 6 | 9% |
| TOTAL SUBGRANT CITIES | 32 | -- | 32 | -- | 64 | -- |

TABLE 12

Type of Youth Programs Operated by Small Cities by Type of Prime Sponsor

| Type of Youth Program | PRIME SPONSOR TYPE | | | | | | TOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Single County | | Local Consortium | | State-Administered | | | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| YCCIP | 7 | 23% | 7 | 47% | 2 | 11% | 16 | 25% |
| YETP | 10 | 32% | 8 | 53% | 11 | 61% | 29 | 45% |
| SYEP | 27 | 87% | 11 | 73% | 14 | 78% | 52 | 81% |
| All Three | 4 | 13% | 5 | 33% | 2 | 11% | 11 | 17% |
| YCCIP Only | 2 | 6% | 1 | 7% | 0 | -- | 3 | 5% |
| SYEP Only | 18 | 58% | 3 | 20% | 6 | 33% | 27 | 42% |
| YETP Only | 2 | 6% | 1 | 7% | 3 | 17% | 6 | 9% |
| TOTAL SUBGRANT CITIES | 31 | -- | 15 | -- | 18 | -- | 64 | -- |

TABLE 13

Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by Prime Sponsor Type

| Method of Participation | PRIME SPONSOR TYPE: Single County Number | Single County Percent | Local Consortium Number | Local Consortium Percent | State-Administered Number | State-Administered Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Participation | 66 | 48% | 20 | 33% | 29 | 29% | 115 | 38% |
| Advisory Council | 44 | 32% | 36 | 59% | 43 | 43% | 123 | 41% |
| Prime's | 43 | 31% | 35 | 57% | 28 | 28% | 106 | 35% |
| Governor's | 1 | 1% | 1 | 2% | 15 | 15% | 17 | 6% |
| Other | 28 | 20% | 18 | 30% | 23 | 23% | 69 | 23% |
| A-95 Clearinghouse | 7 | 5% | 8 | 13% | 7 | 7% | 22 | 7% |
| Other | 21 | 15% | 10 | 17% | 16 | 16% | 47 | 16% |
| No Response | 9 | 7% | 0 | -- | 19 | 19% | 28 | 9% |
| TOTAL CITIES | 138 | -- | 61 | -- | 101 | -- | 300 | -- |

TABLE 14

Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by the City's Perception of Problems Associated with the Structure or Function of the CETA Youth Advisory Council

| Method of Participation | STRUCTURE OR FUNCTION OF ADVISORY COUNCIL | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Not a Problem | | Moderate Problem | | Major Problem | | No Response | | TOTAL | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| No Participation | 34 | 30% | 30 | 26% | 16 | 14% | 35 | 30% | 115 | 100% |
| Advisory Council | 60 | 49% | 49 | 40% | 10 | 8% | 4 | 3% | 123 | 100% |
| Prime's | 55 | 52% | 40 | 38% | 8 | 8% | 3 | 2% | 106 | 100% |
| Governor's | 5 | 29% | 9 | 53% | 2 | 12% | 1 | 6% | 17 | 100% |
| Other | 32 | 46% | 26 | 38% | 4 | 6% | 7 | 10% | 69 | 100% |
| A-95 Clearinghouse | 11 | 50% | 11 | 50% | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 22 | 100% |
| Other | 21 | 44% | 15 | 32% | 4 | 9% | 7 | 15% | 47 | 100% |
| No Response | 1 | 4% | 5 | 18% | 2 | 7% | 20 | 71% | 28 | 100% |
| TOTAL CITIES | 115 | 38% | 92 | 31% | 29 | 10% | 64 | 21% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 15

Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by City Subgrantee Status

| Method of Participation | SUBGRANT STATUS: Subgrantee Number | Subgrantee Percent | Non-Subgrantee Number | Non-Subgrantee Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Participation | 20 | 31% | 95 | 40% | 115 | 38% |
| Advisory Council | 39 | 61% | 84 | 36% | 123 | 41% |
| Prime's | 35 | 55% | 71 | 30% | 106 | 35% |
| Governor's | 4 | 6% | 13 | 6% | 17 | 6% |
| Other | 23 | 36% | 46 | 19% | 69 | 23% |
| A-95 Clearinghouse | 7 | 11% | 15 | 6% | 22 | 7% |
| Other | 16 | 25% | 31 | 13% | 47 | 16% |
| No Response | 0 | -- | 28 | 12% | 28 | 9% |
| TOTAL CITIES | 64 | -- | 236 | -- | 300 | -- |

TABLE 16

Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by City Subgrantee Status

| Method of Participation | SUBGRANT STATUS | | | | TOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Subgrantee | | Non-Subgrantee | | | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| No Participation | 20 | 17% | 95 | 83% | 115 | 100% |
| Advisory Council | 39 | 32% | 84 | 68% | 123 | 100% |
| Prime's | 35 | 33% | 71 | 67% | 106 | 100% |
| Governor's | 4 | 24% | 13 | 76% | 17 | 100% |
| Other | 23 | 33% | 46 | 67% | 69 | 100% |
| A-95 Clearinghouse | 7 | 32% | 15 | 68% | 22 | 100% |
| Other | 16 | 34% | 31 | 66% | 47 | 100% |
| No Response | 0 | -- | 28 | 100% | 28 | 100% |
| TOTAL CITIES | 64 | 21% | 236 | 79% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 17

Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by City Population Size

| Method of Participation | CITY SIZE <50,000 Number | <50,000 Percent | ≥50,000 Number | ≥50,000 Percent | TOTAL Number | TOTAL Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Participation | 86 | 44% | 29 | 27% | 115 | 38% |
| Advisory Council | 66 | 34% | 57 | 54% | 123 | 41% |
| Prime's | 56 | 29% | 50 | 47% | 106 | 35% |
| Governor's | 10 | 5% | 7 | 7% | 17 | 6% |
| Other | 40 | 21% | 29 | 27% | 69 | 23% |
| A-95 Clearing House | 11 | 6% | 11 | 10% | 22 | 7% |
| Other | 29 | 15% | 18 | 17% | 47 | 16% |
| No Response | 21 | 11% | 7 | 7% | 28 | 9% |
| TOTAL CITIES | 194 | -- | 106 | -- | 300 | -- |

TABLE 18

Method of Participation by Small Cities in the Development of Local CETA Policies by the City's Perception of Problems Created by the Program Operator

| Method of Participation | PROBLEMS CREATED FOR CITY BY PROGRAM OPERATOR: Yes | | No | | TOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| No Participation | 31 | 57% | 46 | 36% | 77 | 43% |
| Advisory Council | 17 | 31% | 56 | 44% | 73 | 40% |
| Prime's | 14 | 26% | 49 | 39% | 63 | 35% |
| Governor's | 3 | 5% | 7 | 5% | 10 | 5% |
| Other | 10 | 19% | 30 | 24% | 40 | 22% |
| A-95 Clearinghouse | 3 | 6% | 9 | 7% | 12 | 7% |
| Other | 7 | 13% | 21 | 17% | 28 | 15% |
| No Response | 2 | 4% | 4 | 3% | 6 | 37% |
| TOTAL CITIES | 54 | -- | 127 | -- | 181 | -- |

TABLE 19

Problems of Implementing CETA Youth Programs in Small Cities by Severity of Problem

| | SEVERITY OF PROBLEM | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Not a Problem | | Moderate Problem | | Major Problem | | No Response | | TOTAL | |
| Issues | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Restrictions on Funding | 64 | 21% | 97 | 32% | 101 | 34% | 38 | 13% | 300 | 100% |
| Availability of Suitable Sites | 96 | 32% | 114 | 38% | 54 | 18% | 36 | 12% | 300 | 100% |
| Adequacy of Supervision | 79 | 26% | 106 | 35% | 82 | 27% | 33 | 11% | 300 | 100% |
| Availability of Transportation | 59 | 20% | 131 | 44% | 82 | 27% | 28 | 9% | 300 | 100% |
| Access to Career Counseling | 77 | 26% | 138 | 46% | 55 | 18% | 30 | 10% | 300 | 100% |
| Access to Labor Market Information | 69 | 23% | 143 | 48% | 58 | 19% | 30 | 10% | 300 | 100% |
| Availability of Employment Opportunity | 42 | 14% | 124 | 41% | 104 | 35% | 30 | 10% | 300 | 100% |
| Availability of Local Industry | 77 | 26% | 122 | 41% | 67 | 22% | 34 | 11% | 300 | 100% |
| Lack of Occupational Choice | 64 | 21% | 135 | 45% | 69 | 23% | 32 | 11% | 300 | 100% |
| Availability of Occupational Training | 60 | 20% | 150 | 50% | 58 | 19% | 32 | 11% | 300 | 100% |

TABLE 20

Problems Associated with Implementing CETA Youth Programs In Small Cities by Rank Order

GENERAL RANKING OF PROBLEMS

| RANK ORDER | PERCENT INDICATING PROBLEM | ISSUE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 76% | Availability of Suitable Employment Opportunities |
| 2 | 71% | Lack of Transportation |
| 3 | 69% | Availability of Occupational Training |
| 4 | 68% | Lack of Occupational Choice |
| 5 | 67% | Lack of Labor Market Information |
| 6 | 66% | Restrictions on the Use of CETA Funds |
| 7 | 64% | Access to Career Counseling |
| 8 | 63% | Availability of Local Industry |
| 9 | 62% | Adequate Supervision |
| 10 | 56% | Lack of Suitable CETA Work/Training Sites |

RANKING BY MAJOR PROBLEM AREA

| RANK ORDER | PERCENT INDICATING MAJOR PROBLEM | ISSUE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 35% | Availability of Suitable Employment Opportunities |
| 2 | 34% | Restrictions on the Use of CETA Funds |
| 3 | 27% | Lack of Transportation |
| 4 | 27% | Adequate Supervision |
| 5 | 23% | Lack of Occupational Choice |

TABLE 21

Percentage of Small Cities Indicating Problems with Selected Issues Associated with Implementing CETA Youth Programs by Region

| ISSUE | DEPARTMENT OF LABOR REGION I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | NATIONAL AVERAGE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES | 71% | 73% | 96% | 84% | 66% | 80% | 66% | 64% | 90% | 80% | 76% |
| TRANSPORTATION | 70% | 63% | 77% | 82% | 66% | 80% | 66% | 61% | 73% | 80% | 71% |
| OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING | 71% | 63% | 86% | 68% | 62% | 80% | 50% | 53% | 83% | 60% | 69% |
| OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE | 65% | 63% | 90% | 68% | 60% | 75% | 59% | 38% | 81% | 80% | 68% |
| LABOR MARKET INFORMATION | 65% | 70% | 81% | 71% | 61% | 80% | 59% | 38% | 73% | 60% | 67% |
| FUND RESTRICTIONS | 79% | 63% | 76% | 60% | 62% | 75% | 58% | 46% | 71% | 40% | 66% |
| CAREER COUNSELING | 68% | 63% | 76% | 65% | 57% | 85% | 50% | 39% | 69% | 80% | 64% |
| INDUSTRY | 59% | 70% | 85% | 66% | 53% | 65% | 42% | 46% | 75% | 60% | 63% |
| SUPERVISION | 70% | 60% | 86% | 64% | 62% | 50% | 67% | 54% | 58% | 40% | 62% |
| SUITABLE SITES | 73% | 56% | 90% | 45% | 49% | 55% | 58% | 31% | 59% | 20% | 56% |

TABLE 22

Percentage of Small Cities Indicating Major Problems with Selected Issues Associated with Implementing CETA Youth Programs by Region

| | DEPARTMENT OF LABOR REGION | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ISSUE | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X | NATIONAL AVERAGE |
| EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES | 15% | 43% | 67% | 42% | 24% | 45% | 33% | 33% | 38% | 60% | 35% |
| TRANSPORTATION | 29% | 33% | 29% | 50% | 22% | 15% | 8% | 15% | 23% | 60% | 27% |
| OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING | 9% | 13% | 24% | 13% | 19% | 30% | 8% | 15% | 31% | 40% | 19% |
| OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE | 9% | 20% | 33% | 26% | 16% | 40% | 17% | 23% | 31% | 40% | 23% |
| LABOR MARKET INFORMATION | 12% | 17% | 43% | 24% | 14% | 25% | 17% | 15% | 23% | - | 19% |
| FUND RESTRICTIONS | 41% | 30% | 38% | 34% | 25% | 30% | 33% | 38% | 46% | - | 34% |
| CAREER COUNSELING | 12% | 13% | 24% | 26% | 14% | 30% | 17% | 8% | 21% | 40% | 18% |
| INDUSTRY | 6% | 17% | 33% | 34% | 18% | 40% | 17% | 15% | 25% | 40% | 22% |
| SUPERVISION | 26% | 27% | 38% | 32% | 25% | 30% | 25% | 23% | 25% | 20% | 27% |
| SUITABLE SITES | 26% | 13% | 14% | 16% | 16% | 20% | 25% | 8% | 21% | 20% | 18% |

## APPENDIX B

Summaries of Model Youth Programs
Operating In Small Cities

National League of Cities
1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.
20006
(202) 293-7310
Cable: NLCITIES

OFFICERS:
President
Jesse A. Reilly
Councilman-at-Large, Newport News, Virginia
First Vice President
William H. Hudnut, III
Mayor, Indianapolis, Indiana
Second Vice President
James F. Conway
Mayor, St. Louis, Missouri
Immediate Past President
John P. Rousakis
Mayor, Savannah, Georgia
Executive Director
Alan Beals

## Model Youth Programs in Small Cities

As discussed in the previous section, local officials and program operators who are charged with the responsibility of planning and implementing CETA youth programs in small cities are faced with some very complex and difficult problems. It was with these problems in mind that programs were selected for designation as a model program or program feature.

Programs were not selected on the basis of placement rates or some of the more conventional tests of success. Rather, programs, and features of programs, were selected on the basis of how the program addressed one or more of the problem areas identified in this report.

Because small cities are served under such a wide variety of prime sponsor and subgrant arrangements, the technical framework and other program structures are often not transferable from one small city to the next. Since small cities do not receive CETA grants directly from the Labor Department, small city programs do not have the programming flexibility that prime sponsors have. In contrast, small cities and other local program operators often find themselves locked into an allocation structure, a program planning process, or a youth delivery system that is unyielding to small city needs. To implement programs, small cities often find that they must tailor their programs to fit an existing administrative structure rather than molding the administrative structure to fit their programming needs. Consequently, the conceptual framework and the program strategy tend to be the most useful and the most transferable information.

A more detailed description of these model programs was prepared in a separate report to the Department of Labor, entitled "On-Site Visits and Model Youth Programs in Small Cities."

PAST PRESIDENTS: Tom Bradley, Mayor, Los Angeles, California • Henry W. Maier, Mayor, Milwaukee, Wisconsin • Tom Moody, Mayor, Columbus, Ohio • DIRECTORS: R. Michael Amyx, Executive Director, Virginia Municipal League • Patricia J. Baca, Council President, Albuquerque, New Mexico • Stephen C. Bauer, Executive Director, League of Oregon Cities • Kenneth F. Bowen, Mayor, Lafayette, Louisiana • Kenneth G. Bueche, Executive Director, Colorado Municipal League • Henry G. Cisneros, Council Member, San Antonio, Texas • Charles G. Clark, Mayor, Garland, Texas • Thomas J. Clark, Mayor, Long Beach, California • Willie Dell, Councilwoman, Richmond, Virginia • Arrington Dixon, Council Chairman, Washington, D.C. • Patrick A. Dunne, Executive Director, Mississippi Municipal Association • Woody Eckerly Jr., Council Member, Flint, Michigan • Carl T. Langford, Mayor, Orlando, Florida • Ronald R Lurie, Commissioner, Las Vegas, Nevada • Jim McConn, Mayor, Houston, Texas • Ruth W. Messinger, Council Member, New York, New York • Ernest N. Morial, Mayor, New Orleans, Louisiana • John M. Pastoriza, Director, Michigan Municipal League • Kenneth Payne, Executive Director, Rhode Island League of Cities and Towns • Jayne H. Plank, Mayor, Kensington, Maryland • Joseph R Riley Jr., Mayor, Charleston, South Carolina • Patricia Reeds, Commissioner, Dayton, Ohio • Charles Royer, Mayor, Seattle, Washington • James T. Ryan, Mayor, Arlington Heights, Illinois • Victor F. Snyder, Council Member, Kansas City, Missouri • Fred Tomaga, Mayor, Rocky Mount, North Carolina • Dorothy Van Horn, Council Member, Jefferson, Iowa • John F. Watkins, Executive Director, Alabama League of Municipalities • Bono Wolenik, Mayor, Hayward, California • Ted Wilson, Mayor, Salt Lake City, Utah

## MODEL YOUTH PROGRAMS OPERATING IN SMALL CITIES

1. American Falls, ID
   Student Store

2. Lewiston, ID
   Mobile Career Information

3. Charleston, SC
   Prepare-A-Youth (PAY) Program

4. Altoona, PA
   Agricultural Resources and Environmental Project

5. La Habra, CA
   Diversion-Restitution Program

6. Austin, MN
   Alternative Education Program

7. Redondo Beach, CA
   Vocational Exploration Program

8. Mansfield, OH
   YETP Model Programs

1. **Program:** Student Store

**City:** American Falls, ID

**Program Operator:** American Falls School District No. 381

**Prime Sponsor:** Idaho Manpower Consortium

**Contact Person (s):**

American Falls Superintendent of Schools
School District No. 381, Administrative Offices
827 Fort Hall Avenue
American Falls, ID 83211
(208) 226-5173

Laura Holt, Youth Coordinator
Idaho Manpower Consortium
P. O. Box 35
Boise, ID 83735
(208) 334-2051

**Funding Sources:** CETA-IV, YETP

**Program Summary:** An example of youth entrepreneurship, the youth-operated store offers skill training, work experience, counseling and supportive services to full-time, in-school students and youth attending ABE/GED classes. Academic credit is received for participation. Youth combine classroom training in sales, merchandising, and management techniques with actual operation of the store. A portion of the training curricula involves field visits to local merchantile establishments for well-supervised vocational exploration. Individual progress monitored under a system of pre-testing and post-testing for each of the 18 stated merchandising objectives.

2. **Program:** Mobile Career Information

**City:** Lewiston, ID

**Program Operator:** Career Information Center
Lewis-Clark State College

**Prime Sponsor:** Idaho Manpower Consortium

**Contact Person(s):** Peter Reynolds, Coordinator
Career Information Center
Lewis-Clark State College
528 - 11th Avenue
Lewiston, ID 83501
(208) 746-9629

Laura Holt, Youth Coordinator
Idaho Manpower Consortium
P.O. Box 35
Boise, ID 83735
(208) 334-2051

**Funding Source(s):** CETA II/B

**Program Summary:** Serving a 5-county planning region in the Idaho panhandle region, the Career Information Center (CIC) serves 17 outlaying cities which would not otherwise have access to the youth occupational informational and counseling services of the CIC. Services include audio-visual and written materials, job attitude and interpersonal skills information, job-seeking skills training, occupational counseling, and individualized consultation and guidance. The Center is experimenting with a computerized career information system, which may eventually be used in conjunction with the Center's mobile services. Local private and public employers work closely with Center staff on developing local labor market and career information for use in the audio-visual component of the occupational and career counseling service.

3. **Program:** Prepare-a-Youth (PAY) Program

**City:** Charleston, SC

**Program Operator:** City of Charleston
Employment and Training Department

**Prime Sponsor:** County of Charleston
Manpower Department
(Prior to FY 80, the State of South Carolina CETA Consortium served as Prime Sponsor for all CETA activities state-wide.)

**Contact Person(s):** Charles Daniels, Director
Ronnie DuBose, YETP Program Manager
Employment and Training Department
City of Charleston
60 Lockwood Drive
Charleston, S.C. 29401
(803) 723-9834

John P. O'Keefe, Executive Director
Manpower Department
County of Charleston
P.O. Box 91
Charleston, SC 29402
(803) 577-7800 Ext. 305

**Funding Source(s):** CETA IV, YETP

**Program Summary:** An out-of-school work experience program, the PAY Program offers well-supervised work experience in skilled occupations together with a high level of supportive services and client testing and assessment. Using the Naval Supply Center as the primary work-site, training is structured around a work simplification process that includes a supervisor training, youth performance evaluation, counseling, and placement assistance. On-the-job work experience is supplemented by classroom training provided in conjunction with the County and the Adult Education Program. The County provides for the teachers and books, while the Naval Supply Center provides classroom space and equipment.

4. **Program:** Agriculture Resources and Environmental Project

**City:** Altoona, PA and surrounding communities

**Program Operator:** Altoona Area Vocational-Technical School and Prince Galitzin State Park

**Prime Sponsor:** Southern Alleghenies Consortium

**Contact Person(s):** Stephen Mandes, Executive Director
Marsha Lawther, Youth Program Specialist
Bill Miller, Special Program Specialist
Southern Alleghenies Consortium
1506 - 11th Avenue
Altoona, PA 16602
(814) 946-1673

**Funding Source(s):** CETA IV, YCCIP

**Program Summary:** To accommodate a need for vocational training in agricultural and environmental resource occupations that existing vocational education programs could not meet, an alternative youth training program was designed to combine classroom training and work experience through joint efforts of the local vocational education school and a local state park. Eligible high school students were required to complete all formal high school curricula by their senior year. The senior year was then spent training in this structured agricultural resources program.

5. **Program:** Diversion - Restitution Program

**City:** La Habra, CA

**Program Operator:** La Habra, Manpower Department

**Prime Sponsor:** Orange County Consortium

**Contact Person(s):** Robert Burns, Director
La Habra Employment and Training
Civic Center
P.O. Box 337
La Habra, CA 90631

**Funding Source(s):** LEAA and CETA-IV, YETP

**Program Summary:** The Diversion - Restitution Program is an alternative method of providing juvenile offenders with professional guidance and creates a system by which juvenile offenders can repay the damage to victims. The youth Service Center serves youth from a working group of seven cities in North Orange County and utilizes a multi-agency staff drawing on the resources of the cities in the work group as well as the resources of the county. A major emphasis of the program is the involvement of parents in whatever services are provided. CETA's role in the program is to provide suitable work and training to youth offenders and to provide linkage with private sector employment; while the juvenile justice system provides referral counseling, professional services, and monitoring of restitution.

6. Program: Alternative Education Program

City: Austin, MN

Program Operator: Austin High School

Prime Sponsor: Minnesota BOS

Contact Person(s): Richard White, Director
Alternate School Program
Austin High School
301 Third Street, NW
Austin, MN 55912
(507) 437-6631 Ext. 204

Funding Source(s): CETA IV, YETP; State foundation funds; and voc. ed. monies.

Program Summary: The Alternate School offers youth a combination of well-supervised classroom training activities with work experience and on-the-job training, as well as counseling. Academic credit toward high school credentials may be earned for approved work experience outside the classroom setting. Emphasis is placed on career awareness and exploration.

Serving high school drop-outs and potential drop-outs who are 16-21 years old, funding for the program is provided by a combination of sources: CETA-Title IV, state foundation funds, and vocational education monies. The average annual cost per youth is estimated at approximately $1,500.

7. **Program:** Vocational Exploration Program

**City:** Redondo Beach, CA

**Program Operator:** Redondo Beach Training and Job Development Dept. through subcontract with Community Development Center

**Prime Sponsor:** County of Los Angeles

**Contact Person(s):** Leonard Hendrickx
Title IV Program Coordinator
City of Redondo Beach
CETA Job Training Center
710 Pier Avenue
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254
(213) 372-1171 Ext. 400

**Funding Source(s):** CETA-IV, YETP

**Program Summary:** As a subgrantee of the Los Angeles County Prime Sponsor, the City of Redondo Beach subcontracts with a community-based organization, the Community Development Center, a vocational development center, for vocational exploration program (VEP). The VEP consists of testing, evaluation and assessment services, counseling, job sampling, and work experience. Upon completion of the VEP phase, a youth participant may enter into an on-the-job training program with a private employer. The Targeted Job Tax Credit is also used to facilitate placement of the youth.

8. **Programs:** YETP Model Programs

**City:** Mansfield, Ohio

**Program Operator:** Mansfield Neighborhood Youth Corps

**Prime Sponsor:** Richland-Marrow Employment & Training Admin.

**Contact Person(s):** Darryl Eyster, Program Director
CETA Programs
Mansfield Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC)
27 West Second Street
Mansfield, Ohio 44902
(419) 524-2626

**Funding Source:** CETA-IV, YETP

**Program Summary:** The city of Mansfield CETA Title IV youth programs were developed into six individually designed programs to meet the employment, skill training, and educational needs of in-school and out-of-school youth. The Neighborhood Youth Corps administers the six Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP) to serve youth aged 14-21. The programs are usually operated on a forty week basis, although some programs are funded for a year. Many of the programs' activities have been coupled with Title II B program activities for transition from OJT to work experience and to provide special services to Title II B participants.

## NOTEWORTHY FEATURES OF YOUTH PROGRAMS IN SMALL CITIES

1. Greenville, MS
   Utilization of Non-CETA Funds and a Family Strategy Approach to Serving Youth

2. Altoona, PA
   Rural Economic Development Component

3. La Habra, CA
   Job Creation and Economic Development Activities

4. Weymouth, MA
   Utilization of Private Foundation Funding

5. Highland Park, IL
   Non-CETA Youth Employment Program

6. La Habra, CA
   Creation of Small Cities' Work Group

1. Program Feature: Utilization of non-CETA funds to support CETA youth program activities, with an emphasis on serving youth through a family strategy approach.

City: Greenville, MS
(and surrounding 3-county area)

Program Operator: Washington-Issaquena-Sharkey CAA

Prime Sponsor: BOS Mississippi

Contact Person(s): Eugene McLemore, Executive Director
Washington-Issaquena-Sharkey CAA
P.O. Box 1407
Greenville, MS 38707
(601) 378-8663

Funding Source(s): CETA-IV, CSA, DOE, ACTION, and HEW

Activity Summary: The CAA receives about $2,000,000 per year from a multiplicity of Federal sources, including CETA, CSA, DOE, ACTION, and HEW. Federal funds from these various sources are combined in imaginative ways to provide support for the CETA Youth programs. Unlike large urban areas, where poverty and unemployment tend to be concentrated among the single-parent household, poverty in rural areas, particularly in the South, tends to be a family-oriented problem. Consequently, effective employment and training programs must be designed around a family strategy. The CAA utilizes non-CETA funds to compliment and support CETA-funded youth program activities in several ways: (1) to provide direct supportive assistance for clothing and bill paying; (2) to hire counselors and job developers for youth in CETA programs; (3) to purchase building materials for youth and (4) CETA youth workers provide labor for home repair and weatherization projects.

2. Program Feature: Utilization of CETA monies to fund economic development activities in a rural economy.

City: Altoona, PA
(and surrounding 6-county area)

Program Operator:
1) Otto Enterprises
2) Small Business Development Center
Saint Francis College

Prime Sponsor(s):
Southern Alleghenies Consortium
Stephen Mandes, Exeuctive Director
Marsha Lawther, Youth Program Specialist
Bill Miller, Special Program Specialist
Southern Alleghenies Consortium
1506 - 11th Avenue
Altoona, PA 16602
(814) 946-1673

Funding Source(s): Funding through CETA II-B under Section 676.25-6 of the Federal Regulations.

Activity Summary: Because of the narrow economic base of most small cities and rural communities, the availability of a range of occupational choices and employment opportunities is limited. This situation carries especially critical implications for youth in small cities who must make career employment and training decisions in a local labor market that offers limited opportunity. As a result, strategies for effective implementation of employment and training programs must include creation of new jobs in the private sector as well as maintenance of existing small businesses. Southern Alleghenies Consortium has addressed these problems by using CETA funds to promote local economies and industrial development and to provide technical assistance and other services to small businesses in the private sector.

3. **Program Feature:** Utilization of CETA-Title VII monies to promote job creation and other economic development activities within the local labor market.

**City:** La Habra, CA
(and 4 surrounding cities)

**Program Operator:** City of La Habra

**Prime Sponsors:** Orange County Consortium

**Contact Person(s):** Robert Burns, Director
La Habra Employment and Training Dept.
Civic Center
P.O. Box 337
La Habra, CA 90631
(213) 694-1011

**Funding Source(s):** CETA-VII, PSIP

**Activity Summary:** Under subgrant with the county-wide prime sponsor consortium, a 5-city work group contracts to receive Title VII CETA funds for economic development activities. The economic development program focuses on supporting and expanding the local economic base within each small city. Surveys are taken of existing private business to determine what kind of assistance is needed by local small businesses, and developing training programs to meet the skill demands of new businesses.

4. **Program Feature:** Creation of a private, non-profit organization to obtain private foundation and other funds.

**City:** Weymouth, MA

**Program Operator:** Weymouth Youth Office

**Prime Sponsor:** Massachusetts Balance-of-State

**Contact Person(s):** John F. Curran, Director
Weymouth Youth Office
1440 Commerical Street
Weymouth, MA 02189
(617) 331-1719

**Funding Source(s):** Local Funds

**Activity Summary:** As a city department, the Weymouth Youth Office is limited in its ability to solicit fund from private foundations and other private sources for utilization in developing programs for youth. To overcome this problem, the Weymouth Youth Office, with permission of the town's Board of Selectmen, created a private, non-profit organization. As an incorporated non-profit organization, the agency is able to apply for a variety of private funds from foundations, corporations, and fund-raising activities. These funds can be used to create programs and services that complement those available to youth under the town's Youth Office.

5. **Program Feature:** Help Youth Realize Employment (HYRE): Utilization of non-CETA funds to operate a summer youth employment program for non-CETA eligible youth.

**City:** Highland Park, Illinois

**Program Operators:** Highland Park Youth Committee

**Prime Sponsor:** Lake County

**Contact Person:** Jon Jackson, Director
Highland Park Youth Committee
1830 Greenbay Road
Highland Park, Illinois 60035
(312) 433-3090

**Funding Source:** Local city funds

**Activity Summary:** Help Youth Realize Employment (HYRE) is a unique non-CETA funded program which provides summer jobs to the youth of Highland Park. The program is primarily a complementary unsubsidized component to the CETA Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) that enables ineligible youth to obtain work experience without grant funding from the federal government or the city.

One of the major concerns of the current YEDPA Legislation is that eligibility guidelines disenables many youth who need jobs, but whose family incomes are too high, from becoming eligible for participation in the CETA programs. The HYRE program, however, attempts to serve all community youth who are "needy" or have an interest in obtaining summer employment, irrespective of family income.

6. **Program Feature:** Collaboration of small cities to create the administrative capability to plan and operate CETA youth programs.

**City:** La Habra, CA
(and 7 surrounding small cities)

**Program Operator:** City of La Habra

**Prime Sponsor:** Orange County Manpower Consortium

**Contact Person(s):** Robert Burns, Director
Employment and Training Department
City of La Habra
P.O. Box 337
La Habra, CA 90631
(213) 694-1011

**Funding Source(s):** CETA-All Titles

**Activity Summary:** Many small cities find it administratively unfeasible to operate CETA youth programs. In Orange County, California, 8 smaller cities within the County formed a "work group" to apply for and receive CETA grants. The work group receives a subgrant, with the City of La Habra as the administrative agency for the work group. By agreement among the 8 cities, the subgrant is re-allocated among the 8 smaller cities under a fair share formula. This arrangement allows the complete decentralization of CETA planning and operations to the small city level.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1980-329-379/6602